DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 848	CE 029 933
TITLE	H.R. 1400--Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 1981. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Education, Training and Employment of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Ninety-Seventh Congress, First Session (Norfolk, Virginia, April 6, 1981). Vol. III.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.
REPORT NO	House-Ser-97-9
PUB DATE	81
NOTE	117p.; For a related document see CE 029 932.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Armed Forces; Enlisted Personnel; Financial Support; Hearings; Higher Education; Labor Turnover; *Military Personnel; *Military Service; Officer Personnel; Postsecondary Education; Recruitment; *Student Financial Aid; Tuition Grants; Veterans; *Veterans Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Congress 97th; *Veteran Educational Assistance Act 1981

ABSTRACT

This document is the third volume of a transcript of hearings before a U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee of the Committee on Veteran's Affairs concerning proposed H.R. 1400--the Veterans' Educational Assistance Act of 1981. The proposed Educational Assistance Act, an updated GI Bill, would provide the following educational benefits: 80 percent of college tuition up to $2500 plus a $250 living allowance for 36 months for three years' military service or two years' military service plus four years in the Active Reserve or National Guard (and additional money for longer service); a two-for-one savings plan for educational benefits for career military personnel; an educational leave-of-absence program; and transferability of educational benefits to a spouse or children for career military personnel with a certain number of years' service. The benefits are structured with the goal of increasing military service enlistments of high school graduates and retention of experienced middle-level personnel. In this round of hearings, held in Norfolk, Virginia, commissioned officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted personnel in the field from the Air Force, Navy, and Army voiced their opinions of the bill, and interpreted it as they saw its effects on recruiting, retention, and day-to-day concerns of military personnel. Most of the persons interviewed viewed the bill favorably as a whole, but had reservations about various provisions, and concerns about whether the lure of educational benefits would prompt more mid-career dropouts from the services. Others expressed concern about the 1989 expiration date for use of benefits from the Vietnam-era GI bill, military pay, and living and working conditions. (KC)

H.R. 1400—THE VETERANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1981

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

APRIL 6 AND APRIL 23, 1981

Printed for the use of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Serial No. 97–9

Vol. III

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
80-335 O WASHINGTON : 1981

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY, Mississippi, *Chairman*

DON EDWARDS, California
GEORGE E. DANIELSON, California
JACK BRINKLEY, Georgia
RONALD M. MOTTL, Ohio
ROBERT W. EDGAR, Pennsylvania
SAM B. HALL, Jr., Texas
DOUGLAS APPLEGATE, Ohio
MARVIN LEATH, Texas
WILLIAM HILL BONER, Tennessee
RICHARD C. SHELBY, Alabama
DAN MICA, Florida
THOMAS A. DASCHLE, South Dakota
BOB STUMP, Arizona
PHIL GRAMM, Texas
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
BYRON L. DORGAN, North Dakota

JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, Arkansas
MARGARET M. HECKLER, Massachusetts
CHALMERS P. WYLIE, Ohio
ELWOOD HILLIS, Indiana
TENNYSON GUYER, Ohio
HAROLD S. SAWYER, Michigan
GERALD B. SOLOMON, New York
JIM JEFFRIES, Kansas
BOB McEWEN, Ohio
JIM DUNN, Michigan
CHRIS SMITH, New Jersey
ALBERT LEE SMITH, Alabama
DENNY SMITH, Oregon

MACK G. FLEMING, *Chief Counsel and Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT

ROBERT W. EDGAR, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

DON EDWARDS, California
MARVIN LEATH, Texas
WILLIAM HILL BONER, Tennessee
THOMAS A. DASCHLE, South Dakota
PHIL GRAMM, Texas

MARGARET M. HECKLER, Massachusetts
CHALMERS P. WYLIE, Ohio
HAROLD S. SAWYER, Michigan
JIM JEFFRIES, Kansas
DENNY SMITH, Oregon

CONTENTS

APRIL 6, 1981

Page
H.R. 1400—The Veterans' Educational Assistance Act of 1981 1

STATEMENTS BY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chairman Edgar 1
Representative Margaret M. Heckler 2

WITNESSES

U.S. Navy Junior Enlisted Personnel—A panel consisting of Petty Officer Whitmill, Petty Officer Fruck, Airman Heideman, Seaman Burchtorf, Petty Officer Jakubowski, and Petty Officer Kane 2
U.S. Navy Senior Enlisted Personnel—A panel consisting of Petty Officer Lowe, Petty Officer Huffman, Petty Officer Dmochowski, Chief Grant, Chief Bauer, and Chief Stewart 15
U.S. Navy Commissioned Officer Personnel—A panel consisting of Lt. Comdr. Jack Smith, Lt. Kevin Stone, Lt. Comdr. Terry Etnyre, Ens. Robert Pletl, Jr., and Lt. Comdr. Robert Kissinger 25
U.S. Air Force Commissioned Officer Personnel—A panel consisting of Maj. Mike Evans, Capt. Steve Andersen, Capt. Dale Hill, Lt. Harold Hancock, and Capt. Joe Facenda 34
U.S. Air Force Enlisted Personnel, Panel A—A panel consisting of Sgt. Larry Stokes, Sergeant Weibel, Airman Taylor, Airman Graham, Sgt. Gary Perdew, and Sgt. Stan Aldrich 41
U.S. Air Force Enlisted Personnel, Panel B—A panel consisting of M. Sgt. Robert L. Harris, Airman Deborah A. Bates, Airman Earnestine Gilbert, Sgt. James Franey, and Sgt. Robroy Ockerman 48

APRIL 23, 1981

H.R. 1400—The Veterans' Educational Assistance Act of 1981 53

STATEMENT BY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chairman Edgar 53
Representative Margaret M. Heckler 54

WITNESSES

Frank, Hon. Barney, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts 65
U.S. Army Enlisted Personnel, Panel A—A panel consisting of Private Bogan, Corporal MacNeil, Sergeant Shaffer, Specialist Rutherford, and Private Hicks 57
U.S. Army Enlisted Personnel, Panel B—A panel consisting of Specialist Homes, Staff Sergeant Borges-Bonilla, Sergeant Ferguson, SFC Richard Reiman, and CWO John Vargas 67
U.S. Army Commissioned Officer Personnel—A panel consisting of Lieutenant Colonel Miller, Maj. Linda Kiefer, Lt. Katherine Sarvary, Capt. Gabriel Acosta, and Capt. Felix Blinn 76

4

Page

U.S. Air Force Personnel—A panel consisting of A1C. Michael J. Cook, A1C. William K. Murphy, A1C. Gerald St. Laurent, A1C. Dean R. Brady, Capt. Ronald D. Yoho, Capt. Martin Lopez, Jr., 1st Lt. Bobby J. McGuire, Airman Lou Ann Wesolowski, S. Sgt. Marie Ashmore, Sgt. Anne Y. Loudermilk, Sgt. Greg R. Pusateri, A1C. Stephen R. Hines, 2d Lt. Marianne Owens, Senior Airman Donald W. Robbins, S. Sgt. James M. Connell, and 1st Lt. Brenda Houston-Williams 89

U.S. Military Recruiters—A panel consisting of Master Sergeant Pouliot, U.S. Air Force, Sgt. Legrant Smith, U.S. Army, Sgt. Val Atkinson, U.S. Army, Sergeant Hyche, U.S. Army, Capt. Tom Hawley, U.S. Army, Sgt. Gary Adams, U.S. Army 98

Wells, Richard, department commander, Disabled American Veterans 105

Prepared statement of Mr. Wells 109

Scerra, Joseph, State adjutant, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of Massachusetts 106

Reagan, John, national service officer, Disabled American Veterans 107

H.R. 1400—THE VETERANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1981

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 1981

House of Representatives,
Subcommittee on Education,
Training, and Employment,
Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
Norfolk, Va.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:15 a.m., in Marianas Hall, commissioned officers mess, Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Va., Hon. Robert W. Edgar (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Edgar and Heckler.

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN EDGAR

Mr. **Edgar**. Ladies and gentlemen, the hearing for the Subcommittee on Education, Training, and Employment will come to order.

I'd like to begin by welcoming all of you here. We have held four hearings in Washington on H.R. 1400 and related legislation dealing with education for benefits designed to recruit and retain personnel within the All-Volunteer Force.

The Washington hearings were very comprehensive with over 50 witnesses testifying. We heard from people from all branches of the Federal Government and the public and private sector dealing with this issue.

The purpose of H.R. 1400 is to provide an education and training program to assist in the readjustment of veterans upon their separation from the Armed Forces, to enhance the recruitment capability of the Armed Forces, and to facilitate the retention of key personnel in critical positions.

In that regard, H.R. 1400 provides a basic educational assistance payment of $250 per month for 3 years of active duty service, and $550 per month after 6 years of active duty service for high school graduates.

The bill also provides that service personnel in the Reserves and National Guard can also qualify when that service is combined with active duty service.

I have made available a copy of a thumbnail sketch of H.R. 1400, together with its major provisions, which are available to the press and public.

The subcommittee, as I indicated, has held four hearings on H.R. 1400 in Washington. Witnesses have included the Chief of Staff of the Army and other representatives of the Joint Chiefs; the Secretaries of the Services, and the Chiefs of the Reserves and National Guard.

A number of Members of Congress have appeared, including my distinguished colleague, William Whitehurst of Virginia, and your junior Senator from Virginia, John Warner, both of whom have introduced legislation similar to H.R. 1400.

I'd like to introduce my colleague, Mrs. Heckler, from Massachusetts, who is the ranking Republican on this subcommittee, and I'd like to introduce her for an opening statement at this point. I would like to say that I certainly appreciate her willingness to come and participate in these hearings.

We plan a second field hearing in the Boston, Mass. area, to talk with the Army and, hopefully, at the end of April or the beginning of May, we will mark up legislation dealing with this important issue. Mrs. Heckler?

STATEMENT OF HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mrs. **Heckler**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to state at the opening of this hearing that this is going to be a refreshing change of forum for us. We have been holding hearings on the subject of the new GI bill for some days in Washington. We have had over 50 witnesses, and we've heard from the Secretaries and the Assistant Secretaries and, I would say: The top brass of the military, and now we are out in the field—we will follow this with a hearing in Boston—and we expect to hear from the field personnel who are the people to be directly affected and motivated by the passage of this bill, so that your testimony today is going to be of particular value to us.

I am very pleased, as a woman in the Congress and a member of that small minority, to see the women in the military present today because we are very concerned with the impact of the GI bill and of all military questions of not only the men in the military, who are so significant, but as well the women, who are making a great contribution.

I am anxious to hear the input which you will give us on the questions of the level of assistance, the question of transferability of benefits to a spouse and children, and the question of the retention of your service in the military as a result of the passage of this bill.

There are many serious questions to be addressed, and I want to stress how much we value the input, the insights and the contribution of those who will be our witnesses today.

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you very much. We also have as one of our panelists to ask questions here at the head table, Gwen Perry, of Congressman Whitehurst's staff. We had invited Congressman Whitehurst to be here but, unfortunately, due to previous commitments, he was unable to be with us today. I have asked Gwen to sit at the head table and to feel free to ask the kinds of questions that Congressman Whitehurst would want to know, given his deep interest in this particular issue.

We also have representatives in the audience from Mr. Stone's office, who works in the area of manpower and personnel within the Defense Departnent. I know they are very interested in focusing on this particular issue. They are David Lyles and Sharon Holroyd, from the Department of Defense. We appreciate your being with us this morning.

I would like to move now to the first group of persons to testify. We have divided the witness list up into three segments and the first are junior enlisted personnel. I would like them to come and take their seats at the table, at this point.

STATEMENTS OF A PANEL CONSISTING OF PETTY OFFICER WHITMILL, PETTY OFFICER FRUCK, AIRMAN HEIDEMAN, SEAMAN BURCHTORF, PETTY OFFICER JAKUBOWSKI, AND PETTY OFFICER KANE, ALL OF THE U.S. NAVY

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you very much for being willing to be guinea pigs. As we indicated, our basic interest is to draft a piece of legislation that focuses on GI education incentives and providing a benefit for recruitment and retention throughout one's career.

We would like your frank opinions. We hope that you won't hold back any of your feelings. We'd like to know things like what it was in your life that drew you into the All-Volunteer Force, what your expectations were in coming in, whether or not an educational benefit would have been helpful to you at the point of recruitment, and what kinds of things might be helpful in terms of retaining you in your basic skills, within the service.

I think it probably will be best if we must go down through the panel and hear your opening statements. Then we may pepper you with a few questions. We hope you will relax. We are not going to give you a test or anything. You don't have to have great knowledge of the particulars of the legislation, we are just interested in your focused point of view, given your experience.

Let's start with Mr. Whitmill. Could you give us your full name and what your specialty is and then proceed.

Mr. **Whitmill**. I'm John Whitmill, from Cardiff, N. Mex.

I'm currently assigned to the U.S.S. *John F. Kennedy*. My purpose of work is maintaining the magazine and keeping all the ordnance and weapons up to date, and everything ready to go.

I've been on the ship for about 3 years, and I planned on shipping on for about 2 years.

Mr. **Edgar**. What is your total enlistment? What did you sign up for?

Mr. **Whitmill**. Four years.

Mr. **Edgar**. What brought you into the service?

Mr. **Whitmill**. Well, it was a spur of the moment; I didn't have anything to do that summer, so I just joined; me and about four other guys. I haven't seen them in about 3 years now.

Mr. **Edgar**. When you were deciding to sign up for the All-Volunteer Force, did you think about any benefits beyond just signing up?

Mr. **Whitmill**. Yes. I got in just before the old GI bill ended—about December of 1976.

Mr. **Edgar**. Right. So that was helpful to you, to get in at that point. We will have other questions for you in a minute. Let's move to the next witness, Mr. Fruck.

Mr. **Fruck**. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. My name is Frederick Fruck, and I'm an aviation electrician's mate, second class. I am currently assigned to the U.S.S. *John F. Kennedy.* I have been in the Navy approximately 7½ years.

I've gone through basic training at Orlando, Fla., Aviation Electrician's Mate Class A School in Memphis, Tenn., and then I spent 1 month at Coronado, Calif., undergoing Aircrew Survival Training School.

I served 3 years with Fleet Composite Squadron 5 on Okinawa, Japan, and then approximately 3 years with Training Squadron 27, Corpus Christi, Tex. I came aboard the *John F. Kennedy* in December. My enlistment runs out in September.

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you. We will have some specific questions, for you given the fact that you have been in the service for 7½ years. The terms of the transferability provision in this bill, as well as the impact 1989 cut-off date of the Vietnam era GI bill, will affect you, I'm sure.

Let's move to our next witness at this point, Airman Heideman.

Mr. **Heideman**. I'm Airman Heideman. I'm an airman apprentice. I've been in the Navy for 6 months. I completed basic training at Great Lakes, Ill., went through ATD at Great Lakes, Ill., met the *Kennedy* half-way through the Med cruise, and I'm here now.

Mr. **Edgar**. OK. Very good. We will come back for questions. Why don't we have the rest of the panelists introduce themselves.

Ms. **Burchtorf**. I'm Seaman Julie Burchtorf. I'm from Baker, Oreg. I'm an Ocean Systems Technician A School student, and I've been in the Navy for 4 months. I'm single, no dependents.

Mr. **Edgar**. OK. Very good.

Mr. **Jakubowski**. Good morning, I'm Andy Jakubowski. I'm aerographer's mate second class petty officer aboard the *Eisenhower.* I've been in the Navy 3½ years. After basic training and A school, I reported aboard the *Eisenhower,* in April of 1978.

Aboard the *Eisenhower,* my primary duties are in aviation weather. I have made two major deployments, one of 6 months in the Mediterranean in 1979 and, more recently, our recordbreaking Indian Ocean deployment.

On March 25, I reenlisted for 4 years. I will be transferring off the *Eisenhower* in May for 19 weeks of B school. After completion of school, I will be stationed at Barbers Point NAS, Hawaii.

I am a native of Toledo, Ohio; I'm 25 years old. I've been married for 3 years and have a 9-month-old son who, incidentally, was born while I was in the Indian Ocean.

Mr. **Kane**. Good morning. My name is Dwight John Kane, and I'm an aviation storekeeper, second class. I am presently, too, assigned to the U.S.S. *John F. Kennedy,* and I have recently completed my first 4-year hitch, as the term goes and have extended until the fall of this year.

My tours of duty have been basic training in Great Lakes in 1976; in January, I went to AK school in Meridian, Miss.; left there and had 2 years aboard the U.S.S. *Independence,* then had a humanitarian transfer to HSL 32 in Norfolk, which is a shore duty squadron billet, and then my current tour aboard the *Kennedy.*

I was storage supervisor when I was on the *Independence* for my division, and then when I got to the squadron I handled the materiel procurement, which is ordering and receiving parts and handled some of their OPTAR.

More recently, I have been supervisor for our deployment. We just, too, came back 10 days ago from the Mediterranean. We had an 8-month tour out there, and I am in charge of training people in my section.

I'm married, 28, and have a 2½-year-old beautiful little girl.

Mr. Edgar. Thank you very much. Let me start the questioning with you and we will go back down in the other direction. I'm sure my colleagues will have some additional questions as well.

You talked about being in charge of training. You have some idea of how to put together an education package to teach people how to do basic skills. You also, in your training experience, understand that the Federal Government, at fairly large expense, brings people within the All-Volunteer Army and trains them with specific skills.

Can you describe some of the pressures that you see in your area of work, where people learn a basic skill, technical skill, and have a great deal of pressure to leave the service and use that skill other places?

Mr. Kane. Are you saying what can they be taught that they can take with them and use on the outside?

Mr. Edgar. I guess I'm trying to get a handle on what skills we teach people that are incentives for them to leave the military and go and use those skills in the private sector. Let's back up a second. What kinds of things do you teach people to do?

Mr. Kane. Well, in choosing a job as a storekeeper, they have to be aware—if a particular squadron is looking for a part, they have to be able to cross it to another number, they have to be able to locate it, find it, do all the correct paperwork so that their data processing works out to be correct. They have to be able to do what they can to get the aircraft up, as far as parts and maintenance. If there are several components missing one particular part, they may be able to crisscross it and get the bird up.

Mr. Edgar. Let me ask you another specific question. Why do people leave the service, in your opinion?

Mr. Kane. I believe they thought there was a misconception. When I had gone to boot camp in October 1976, a gentleman there had asked the question if he thought there was any difference in the military as we maybe have seen in the John Wayne movies, and so forth, and what we are actually facing in the 9 weeks there.

I guess it would be a little old fashioned, in this day and age, to say that maybe pride is about the only word that is eliminated from military, and if I knew that at 3 weeks of being in there, it doesn't matter how many deployments or now, it hasn't changed that much. You have to do what you think is right, to that extent.

But training people to do their jobs, if they do it well, you know, then that's—they're only going to make themselves feel good. You have people that come in that are just there to fill a billet, that really have got nonchalant attitudes, and they look at their watch and say, "Is it time to go," so, you have different calibers of people. You have a lot of people that really do care and do try to give you——

Mr. Edgar. I was just going to say, what could we do to entice the really qualified and capable and motivated young people who come in, in your opinion, to stay? Would an education incentive help?

Mr. **Kane**. Well, sir, Thursday afternoon, I think, most of us in this room here probably found out we were coming here. We listened to the people—so we had an idea of what was going on here today, on Friday. We all had a lot of questions that had to be asked, and they probably will be asked throughout the course of the day—and I didn't want to appear to take it all up—but the changing, of going from the previous 1976 expiration of the GI bill to the tuition aid has only been 2 years. A lot of people might think, "Well, 2 years later, will something else be changed," and most of us in the room are probably fairly new, or just over the 4-year period. I think you will find out that you have very few senior men who could—who maybe understand it a lot more than most of us in the room, that after making this change, and having another change, well, there would be too many changes in the upset. People will say, "Well, when I came in, we had this program and, now, 4 years later, we are on our third program." They may say, "If the military has no idea what they are doing, maybe I should just take what I've got and go for the front door."

Mr. **Edgar**. Just to respond to your question, one of the purposes for developing a GI educational bill at this time is the uncertainty that you have raised. The fact that we terminated in December of 1976 the old Vietnam GI bill, with the arbitrary termination date of 1989, is going to impact on some. We will be asking questions about that. We also have the VEAP program, which is a contributory program, that has varying degrees of success in terms of how much the military personnel contribute, and how much the Federal Government contributes. In our discussions with some of the recruiters, we discovered that there are some test programs out there that different committees of Congress have put in place. There is a great deal of confusion as to what the Federal Government is going to provide for veterans' benefits.

The thought behind this bill is not to have that up-and-down syndrome. Our design is to put in place a bill that will be a peacetime GI bill that will be in place for the foreseeable future. Nothing is permanent, nothing is forever, but our proposal will be a permanent benefit just like salary is a benefit. The new GI bill will be a recruitment tool for recruiters to say, "Look, if you give *x* number of years of service, this is what you can expect after 3 years; this is what you can expect after 6 years; this is what you can transfer to your wife and children after 8 years of service." Our GI bill would be something that would be a very permanent fixture, but would aid not only in the recruitment but also in retention.

We have come here to ask: "Do we need to eliminate the uncertainty that you feel? Would putting in place an educational bill at this time in history be helpful to you? Do you think it would be helpful in recruiting new people within the All-Volunteer Services?" For those of you who have been, as Mr. Fruck has been, for 7½ years in the service, would this bill be an incentive to retain people within the All-Volunteer Force by giving them the transferability provisions in this legislation. Would it act as an incentive to stay on active duty if you thought you could give your children or your wife an educational opportunity, by virtue of this legislation?

Let me go over to Mr. Fruck at this point, and talk about the transferability provisions of the legislation. What do you think, at this point, after 7½ years in. What would it take to retain you within the service?

Mr. **Fruck**. As far as the transferability, I think it would be very important. For myself, it would probably be good because in the rating that I'm in now, if I decided to make a career of the Navy for 20 years, I could probably get all the additional schooling that I would need while I'm still in the military, through military schools, for my job. With the cost of inflation and everything nowadays, the thought of being able to put one of my children through college when I retire would be very helpful, and it's something to look forward to.

It is something, sort of like a pension-type setup, where you know what's there and you're going to have it when you get there, and it will help your children.

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you. I'm going to yield to my colleague from Massachusetts, Mrs. Heckler.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to say to Mr. Kane that I appreciate the anxieties and frustration that a military person would experience because of changes in programs, but I think that it is important for everyone in the military today to take heart from the fact that the direction is in favor of more benefits, more support, greater strength in the military, and certainly the development of programs that will be infinitely more effective than those that we've passed in bygone years.

So, we have come full cycle in America, from the point where we were experiencing the Vietnam nightmare and many Americans recoiled from any military involvement whatsoever, to the point where there is a great awareness of the need for strengthening the military and for making military men and women content, for satisfying their human needs and their professional needs, and for developing a very high caliber professional service in which we will have a great deal of pride as well as confidence.

Along those lines, I wonder what you would think of the provision of this bill which would grant the educational benefits only to those who are in the so-called critical skills area.

Mr. **Kane**. Are you talking about the rates that are hard to come by—in other words, where the people are——

Mrs. **Heckler**. The skills that become shortage areas, shortage skills that are very, very important, when they are classified as critical skills, according to one version of this bill—and there are quite a few versions, as a matter of fact—but the one that we are looking at, H.R. 1400, would link the eligibility for educational assistance to the job definition of the person, of the service person, as being in a critical skills area. Do you think that that would be a fair means of determining eligibility?

Mr. **Kane**. Well, the critical billets to the Navy, and having known people that are considered critical billets, usually get a bonus. Now, myself, being a storekeeper, I do not fall under a critical billet, so I guess you might say there would be a little prejudice there, but being the fact that in some cases, certain submarine and certain aviation rates do get a quite sizable benefit, something else that is a retention incentive to start with for them, whereas, in all other rates, there is not. In most of your supply department that I'm familiar with, there isn't one out of the seven or eight different types that there are, that it would be, so, I would say, no. I mean, they already have one, and they are one up on us to start with; why give them two?

Mrs. Heckler. Do you feel any resentment because some of your colleagues in the service do get this special bonus for special duty? Do you feel that that is an unfair system?

Mr. **Kane**. I do, due to the fact that we all made the same 8-month deployment. We were all there for 24 hours a day, you know—it was 237 days or whatever it was. Now, maybe their talents to their jobs are a bit more in depth, but—I'd say, yes— but I understand that they got it. I understand that the submarine guys get what they get, so not really because I understand what they have to do for it.

Mrs. **Heckler**. What would make you decide to stay in the Navy for 20 years? What would you like, what incentives would keep you in the Navy?

Mr. **Kane**. Well, I have thought of that. While I was at HSL 32, I had some precollege to start with, and I was taking one or two courses, and I, myself, am fairly content with it. You know, everybody wants more money. There isn't anybody in the room that wouldn't take it if they could get it, so I have nothing more—I figure I'm getting my education one way or another and, if someone wants to make sure that I don't—I used the tuition aid program, which is a small percentage, and that suited me.

Now, if someone told me 10 years from now that my wife could go back to school, I would have to say that would be quite worthy. Even if it was the same percentage as the tuition aid or the program that is now in progress, it certainly is that much less, and it's something to think about.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Ms. Burchtorf, I wonder what you would think about the effectiveness of an educational assistance program for women in the military? Do you think that women are more inclined to stay in the military if they have a new GI bill which will give them the opportunity to get more education themselves, or transfer it to their husband and children?

Ms. **Burchtorf**. Well, personally, I have already got most of my education out of the way. I came for what the Navy could give me while I'm still in the service. I am not a part of the veterans educational program at this time. I think that the transferability part would be more of an incentive to the women for their children and for their spouses at this time, from the people that I have talked to about it. A lot of women come in for the educational benefits because it is hard in the outside world, at this time, to get a job anywhere unless you have a degree, and the Navy does offer that.

A lot of people have talked about the contributory program. They like the old GI bill better. As I said, I've only been in for 4 months, and I haven't had a chance to look into all the different educational benefits.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Do you have a degree?

Ms. Burchtorf. I have 1½ years left to get my degree.

Mrs. Heckler. And are you going to get that degree while in the Navy?

Ms. Burchtorf. Yes; I should be able to get it going to night school, hopefully.

Mrs. Heckler. Can you see yourself staying in the Navy for 20 years?

Ms. Burchtorf. Yes; I think I'm going to try and go up for an officer program, if possible, as soon as I get my degree, but I don't know about after that. I would like to make a career of the Navy at this time.

Mrs. Heckler. That's good to hear. Mr. Whitmill, I'd like to ask you whether or not—what would make you stay in the Navy? What would be the most desirable incentive that would help you make a decision to make a commitment for 20 years in the U.S. Navy?

Mr. Whitmill. Well, a reenlistment bonus would help a little.

Mrs. Heckler. You're more interested in money than the educational benefits, is that it?

Mr. Whitmill. The benefits would help also, but just seeing most people in my rate are most likely to get out and find a different job, and the job I am with now is not really related to any civilian job. The educational benefits would help a lot, a whole lot, so I probably, if I couldn't get a bonus, I'd probably get out and go to school and try to find something else to do.

Mrs. Heckler. If this bill passes, you will be able to get the benefits if you stay in the military, and not wait until you become a veteran. You will be eligible during the time of your service in the military. Would that make a difference to you, in keeping you in the Navy?

Mr. Whitmill. Yes; it probably would. Going to school and staying in the Navy would be all right, but going on deployments—you know, you can get more education when out at sea during the deployments.

Mr. Edgar. Let me yield at this time to Gwen Perry, aide to Congressman Whitehurst. Do you have any questions at this time?

Ms. Perry. No; I don't think so. I'd like to say good morning, and it is nice to be here. I'm glad to see everyone out there this morning, and opening up and talking with us.

I did have one question for Mr. Kane. You indicated that you are on an extension at this time?

Mr. Kane. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Perry. You've finished up your first 4 years, you are on an extension now, and you did not reenlist?

Mr. Kane. No; I did not reenlist at the time because I was—when I had left HSL 32, I had less than 6 months, and they had sent me to a school for a month. When I got to the school, they said, "Wait a minute, guy, you only have 6 months left." They said you need 12 months minimum, so I signed an extension from May to May, and what I'm probably going to do—more than likely, in a few weeks—is extend from May until September and get shore duty orders somewhere in the Tidewater area, I assume.

You're asking me, "Why haven't I shipped over?"

Ms. **Perry**. Well, basically, what I want to ask some of the other people is, we are trying to get a basic feel on how some of the steps that have been taken to try to retain people are working and effecting. I see you had extended at a time when the extension would have given you an opportunity to look at what Congress is doing for our people in the military.

We got the 11.7 back in June, but I think there seems to be some feeling that we want to see if we're going to continue with benefits. I wondered if you were taking time to take a look and see what was coming in the future for the military personnel and things like educational benefits, an extension of the 1989 deadline and that sort of thing.

Mr. **Kane**. No. As a matter of fact, being that we found out this on Thursday, and I believe of most of the people in the command, the only people that are aware of this at this moment, other than maybe a career counselor or two, are the people that are in this room, at least that is my impression, from the five or six guys that came over from the *Kennedy* who seem to have the upper news on it.

Ms. **Perry**. Mr. Jakubowski? You're going to love Barbers Point.

Mr. **Jakubowski**. If I can afford it.

Mr. **Edgar**. Let me ask a couple of questions before we dismiss the panel. This is a panel of junior enlisted personnel. We hope to have a panel next of senior enlisted people, and follow that by some officers. We hope to get many different points of view. But I would like to take advantage of the expertise, particularly of Mr. Heideman and Ms. Burchtorf.

Of the two of you, one has been in for 6 months and the other 4 months. You are probably the newest in terms of being recently recruited and introduced to the All-Volunteer Service. You indicated that you were just looking at some of the benefits. We talked to Mr. Kane about the fact that it is a little confusing right now because there are some education test programs currently being offered new recruits and, in fact, the administration is saying, "We don't want this particular bill to pass right now because we want to see how those test programs come out." Yet most of the uniformed officers that testified in Washington said, "Look, the test programs aren't going to give us very much data. The information we have now is that pay incentives and reenlistment incentives are a partial motivation for keeping people within the service, but we think we have enough data from past GI bills to indicate that they have really been an incentive to help people go into the service. Education benefits have encouraged people to know that once they complete their service, they can have 36 months or 45 months of benefits accruing to them."

Now, I wonder, from your perspective, if you could just relax and take us back 4 months and 6 months, as you went through the process of making your decision to go into the military. What were some of the ingredients that you looked at? Was it the economic issues around you? Was it the job issues? Was it the education issues?

What kinds of things motivated you to make the decision to go into the All-Volunteer Service?

Mr. **Heideman**. Well, when I came into the service, before I came in, I was working three jobs a day.

Mr. **Edgar**. Where was that?

Mr. **Heideman**. I was working for United Oil, Star News, and for policemen's-firemen's insurance, working jobs out on the yards and so forth. When I came in I figured I didn't want to do this certain thing all my life—plenty of money but no time to enjoy it, so I figured if I came into the military, I could get an education and benefit myself and so forth.

Mr. **Edgar**. So that it wasn't just to get one job, it was also to get trained in some specific skill that you thought you might use later on?

Mr. **Heideman**. Right.

Mr. **Edgar**. Did you think about staying in the service for a long period of time, or was your basic commitment for a narrower few years of service and then go out into the real world and do other things?

Mr. **Heideman**. Well, when I first signed up, it was basically for an education, put my 4 years in and come out and get a half-way decent job. I couldn't really say about the—you know, 20 years of it—because I haven't really seen that much of what it's about.

Mr. **Edgar**. How about you, Ms. Burchtorf?

Ms. **Burchtorf**. When I came in, it was basically for the education because, as I said, I can still get my degree while I'm still in the service. I would like to put in more than 4 years. I didn't come in just to put in 4 years and get an education and get trained in a job I could use in the outside world.

I think what he is trying to say is that the pay is a lot better for somebody on the outside world at this time, and you can come in and get an education in something. At least people on the outside world will look at somebody that has been trained in the military, that they have been trained well in their job, and they will hire them right out.

So, that's why I was thinking the pay is not the biggest thing. For me, it is the education. It would be more to my advantage to get it while I'm in than to join the contributory program. I think that a GI bill such that you didn't have to contribute like it was in 1976, would be more advantageous to me to stay in.

Mr. **Edgar**. As you know, in an All-Volunteer Force, we need to recruit a lot of people and retain a smaller number of skilled people, and it costs a great deal to train you in your specific skill. As you indicated, on the outside world, there are jobs that you can get where you can take that training and use it productively and get rewarded financially.

The question then comes, what can we do in an All-Volunteer Force not only to train you to a specific skill, but to give you the incentive to stay within the system, at least for an additional 4 years, and perhaps for several reenlistments. What kinds of things might help? Does anyone on the panel want to try to tackle that question, or the earlier question about what it was that brought you within the system?

Mr. **Kane**. Security, for one. I was 24 and working, and I had enough money. I said, "Well, this is terrific." I had been to college for a year, and I was still at a deadend street, and had turned this way, you know, toward the Navy. So, that is one. I do have a question later on.

Mr. Edgar. OK. Let me just go through the different elements of this particular bill, in order to get your impressions.

The first element is a basic benefit of $250 after 3 years of service that you can use for 36 months following discharge. The reason for the $250 benefit early on is that it is not so high that it acts as an incentive to bail out of the system, but at the same time it does provide a benefit.

The higher benefit comes after 6 years of service, where that benefit goes up to $550. Do you think that benefit level is high enough?

Mr. Jakubowski. It is certainly better than they have now.

Mr. Edgar. One other provision of the bill is that the benefit would only be offered to high school graduate enlistees. There was some testimony in Washington that we ought to let everybody into the package and not just have it for those who have graduated from high school. Do you have any feelings about that?

Mr. Jakubowski. The part about the high school graduates, I can't understand that at all. What I was surprised to learn today was the provision about giving it just to the certain critical ratings. That's another thing I couldn't agree with.

Mr. Edgar. Let's be clear on that. The only eligibility for benefits granted to personnel on critical ratings is the provision on transferability. I have some questions about that myself. Between the 8th and the 12th year benefits can be transferred to families. According to the legislation the Secretary of Defense would determine which are the critical skills he would select that would be eligible for this benefit as an enticement to keep those personnel in the service.

We received some testimony in Washington that this provision was not helpful because it was discriminatory. We are trying to obtain a cost figure on the price of granting that transferability benefit to everyone. I'm afraid that's a matter of cost at this point, and not a matter of our own judgments. But everyone would get the $250 a month if they stayed in after 3 years. And, after 6 years, everyone would get $550 a month benefit that they could use. But when you get to the 8th of the 12th year, in terms of transferring the benefits to your family, you'd have to be in a critical skill in order to get that transfer entitlement, under the present bill. We can amend it, and one of the things we will have to do is to look at those provisions for amending. Mr. Kane?

Mr. Kane. You said the possibility of transferring would have to be—transferring of education to a dependent, if I read this correctly, would have to be if you fall in a critical——

Mr. Edgar. That's correct.

Mr. Kane. No, no. [Laughter.]

I mean, that's——

Mr. Edgar. That's one of the reasons we came to talk to you folks. The guys in Washington said, "Hey, we could save some money if we just gave it to those critical skill people," and some of us said, "Maybe that's not a good idea", so we thought we would come and ask you.

Mr. **Kane**. And then the guy who's in a critical rate doesn't even tell his wife and children about it, and it slips by, and someone who could use it and is staying in, because he's not in a critical billet—that's no good.

Mr. **Edgar**. Dumb, right?

Mr. **Kane**. Dumb.

Mr. **Edgar**. That's what we want to hear. We want to bear what you think of this provision.

Mr. **Kane**. Can I ask a question at this point?

Mr. **Edgar**. Sure.

Mr. **Kane**. I think most of us are a little lost who have not come in when they had the GI bill. It seemed that most people were in favor of it then. Most people seem to be in favor of it here today, and it got lost to this pay-tuition program.

Now, did it get lost because everybody tied it up with Vietnam, or is it because somebody said, "Hey, we've got to cut money," and in went the ax, and they came up with this program, and here, again, once again, we go for a change.

If they do get it, what's to stop them from saying "OK, now we need money, and we've got to cut and hish-hash." I think the idea of this program, or any one of these, being here 16 years from now is going to be few and far between, from just the way things are going. And people have—you know, everybody cuts, and the military, there for a while, was the first place to go, and they snip and snap.

Mr. **Edgar**. Let me be clear with you. The recommendation came from President Ford, to eliminate what was called the Vietnam era GI bill. GI bills have traditionally been implemented for a particular war or war era. After Korea, they reenacted a GI bill, after Vietnam, they reenacted a GI education bill, and after the war was declared over in 1975, it seemed like a reasonable response to move toward termination of those GI bill benefits.

Then it was thought, "Well, what are you going to do in its place," and they invented the VEAP program, the veterans education assistance program. VEAP was a contrived medium, to attempt try to make up for the termination in December of 1976 of the old veterans GI bill.

I think that both Mrs. Heckler and I would have preferred to keep the Vietnam era education benefit in place. I fought on the floor back in 1975 and 1976 to extend what is called the delimiting date, to make it unlimited. I wanted to say, that if you serve for 3 years or for 4 years and you get a basic benefit of 35 months of education, you ought to be able to use it within your lifetime or within a larger period of time than some 8-year or 10-year delimiting period. However, sometimes the process gets caught up in budget decisions.

I have to say that if this bill is signed by the President, it will go a long way to helping the All-Volunteer Army.

Now, there's a lot of pressure in Washington to move toward the draft and to go back to a Selective Service System or universal draft system, where everybody serves.

Some of us, and I happen to be one, strongly feel that we ought to recognize that having an All-Volunteer Army is different than having a draft. In one sense you might have to pay more, but you have to have recruitment incentives and pay incentives and reenlistment incentives. But in an All-Volunteer Army, an education incentive is also most helpful. I happen to feel very strongly that we ought to keep the All-Volunteer Services. We ought to recognize that we've got to fine tune the All-Volunteer Service, and not treat it like the old draft system. We must look at it as a professional force of people who have critical skills in almost every instance designed to keep our Nation's militarily strong and our defense system in readiness. So, that's why I'm eager to see us put in place, not for a temporary time period, but to put in place a permanent education bill that can be helpful to recruiters as they go out across the country and say to young people, "we can give you something."

The new administration is trying to cut back on student loans whose value may even be higher than what we are offering here. Many young people are saying, "Hey, I can't afford to go to regular colleges, but if I enlist and spend 3 years in the service, I can come out and get a basic benefit and complete my education. If I stay 6 years, I can get a higher benefit," so we are offering an education benefit for inducement for military service.

Retention is also a factor. If you give too many benefits up front, all of you will say, "Hey, it's better to go out on the outside," either for salary reasons or for education reasons. That's why we have the two-tiered funding mechanism built into this legislation.

The third tier offered in H.R. 1400 is transferability. How do you retain somebody over the long haul, who has a basic skill? We are not experts, necessarily, in taking all of the bugs out of the educational benefits, but we think this could be a very permanent and yet a very helpful provision within the benefit system of keeping and improving the All-Volunteer Force.

If you want to move back to a draft, and if that is approved in Washington, then I think that things will change very drastically for military personnel. Pay levels will lower and education incentives will lower, and there will be quite a wrenching of the military forces as we know it. But presently, at this time in human history in the United States, the commitment is to keep the All-Volunteer Force. Our question is, how do we make it attractive enough for people to stay in the military?

We need to move on to another panel, but before you leave, I want to yield to my colleague from Massachusetts, who may have some final comments that she would like to make.

Mrs. Heckler. Well, I would just like to state that I think that the issue that has been raised here by Mr. Kane, the predictability of benefits, uncertainty of future funding, a change, a potential change in course, is undoubtedly one of the major problems with the military today because there are serious problems about the future pension rights, pension benefits, and I think the very zig-zag motion in the last few years has fueled the feeling of unpredictability, uncertainty.

I think we are very aware of this. I feel very strongly that whatever benefits we put in place will be designed to recruit and retain, as the chairman has said, members of the military today and, second, to protect the benefits for those who will be included in the eligibility area, so that those of us who are concerned—and I think the vast majority, overwhelming majority of the Congress is concerned—with building up the military both for the needs of defense and because we realize the manpower needs have not been adequately met, and we must secure them, not merely attract them, but keep them.

I think that under those circumstances, there will be a very strong feeling to protect the benefits and the rights that are established so that if there are future zigs and zags in the legislative history, they will not undermine the benefits or the strengths of the military career.

What future changes would be likely to occur would, in the absence of a draft, be inclined to increase what we have, change direction, but to the enrichment of the service person, not in subtraction from what that person has received, or will receive. And if there are further changes, there would be adequate notice so that plans could be made and fairness achieved.

In this new mood in America and new mood in the Congress, the defense needs of the country are being considered a priority item. Certainly high on the list is not only the question of weapons and ships and vessels and so forth, the flotilla that we have seen out here in the ocean, but really the important resource, human resources, of the military, which is what this program is all about.

So, I do think that you have made a very fine presentation, all of you, and I am really very pleased to have the kind of question-and-answer exchange that we had. I wish to allay some of the fears because I think there is grave concern that your needs must be met, and that we are proud of our military and want to be more so, and we want you to be proud of your service as well, and that is a goal that only can be accomplished if we can trust each other, and the military person has to be able to trust the Government, too.

Mr. **Edgar**. You have been very fine witnesses. We appreciate your taking the time, as scary as it is, to come and talk to us about these issues. If you have additional questions or comments, I hope that some of you will sit and listen as the other panelists talk, and try to get a handle on what we are trying to do here discussing educational benefits. I want to say thank you to all of you for coming.

Let's move now to the second panel of senior enlisted personnel.

Welcome, gentlemen. I think all of you were here when we went through the first panel. Why don't we just go down the line as we did before, introduce yourselves, tell us a little bit about yourselves, where you are from, and any opening comment you would like to make. Then we will pursue some of the same questions that we asked the previous panel. Let's begin with Mr. Lowe.

STATEMENTS OF A PANEL CONSISTING OF PETTY OFFICER LOWE, PETTY OFFICER HUFFMAN, PETTY OFFICER DMOCHOWSKI, CHIEF GRANT, CHIEF BAUER, AND CHIEF STEWART, ALL OF THE U.S. NAVY

Mr. **Lowe**. My name is Lowe, I'm AS-1, stationed on the U.S.S. *John F. Kennedy*. I have been on there for 1 year. I have 2 years left to go. I'm a native of upstate New York. I have 14 years in the service. I have been stationed at various places, just about everywhere.

Mr. **Dmochowski**. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee. My name is Ross Dmochowski. I'm an electronics technician first class petty officer. My parent command is the U.S.S. *Bluefish* SSN-675; it's a nuclear powered submarine.

Currently, I am attached to Submarine Squadron 6, on temporary assignment. I've been in the Navy for 5½ years now, and my tours of duty have included, after basic training at Orlando, Fla., ET A school in Great Lakes, Ill.; Nuclear Power School in Orlando, Fla; Nuclear Power Prototype in Saratoga Springs, N.Y., and now my current tour aboard the *Bluefish*.

I am responsible for operating the nuclear reactor, and maintaining the controls and instrumentation equipment associated with the reactor.

During my tour on the *Bluefish*, I have made three major deployments; one has been to the North Atlantic, another one to the Mediterranean, and the last one to the Indian Ocean.

I'm 28 years old and I'm on my second enlistment, and I maintain Pennsylvania as my permanent home of record.

Mr. **Edgar**. Let's have a round of applause for Pennsylvania. Where in Pennsylvania?

Mr. **Dmochowski**. Sharon, Pa.

Mr. **Edgar**. Good place to be from. Mr. Grant?

Mr. **Grant**. My name is Carson Grant. I am a chief fire control technician, guns. I am currently stationed aboard the U.S.S. *Farragut*, DDG-37. I have almost 10 years of service in, it will be 10 years in July. My training in the service after basic training has been FT A school at Mare Island, Calif., followed by advanced electronics training in Great Lakes, and then a tour of duty of 4½ years aboard the U.S.S. *Ainsworth*, which I precommissioned. During that time, I attended a factory course by McDonnell-Douglas on a Harpoon weapons system, then had a 3-year instructor tour at Damneck, teaching the Harpoon weapons system to officers and enlisted personnel.

Now, to my current command, I operate and maintain the fire control computers and radars aboard the ship, strictly of the guns, myself. I supervise and train junior personnel. I have nine personnel working for me at this time, hopefully.

I have made one South American deployment of about 5 months, two 6-month Mediterranean deployments, and I am recently returned from a 5-month Mediterranean-Indian Ocean deployment.

I am 28 years old. I have been married twice. I have two children from my first marriage, which lasted about 7 years, who are living with me at this time, and my second marriage is in its fourth year, and I have two children from that marriage. Their ages are 11, 8, 5, and 2.

Mr. **Edgar**. Mr. Huffman?

Mr. **Huffman**. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Mrs. Heckler. I'm Delmer Huffman, interior communications electrician first class petty officer. I am currently assigned to the U.S.S. *Newport*, LST-1179, a tank landing ship.

I have been in the Navy for 11 years. My tours of duty have included serving aboard three destroyers, another LST, shore duty at Training Squadron 4 at NAS Pensacola, and this current tour.

I have worked on metering, ordering, alarm, plotting, and telephone systems. I have made five deployments to the North Atlantic, made five deployments to the Mediterranean, and I've been in the Indian Ocean twice. I'm 40 years old and have been married 13 years, have five children; the oldest one 12, twins 10, oldest boy 9, and the youngest boy 7.

Mr. EDGAR. Very good. Thank you for that. Mr. Stewart?

Mr. STEWART. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, Mrs. Heckler. I am Ronald Stewart, aviation electronics specialist chief petty officer. My specialty is operation and repair of automatic test equipment. I am currently assigned to the U.S.S. *John F. Kennedy.* I have just returned from an 8-month Mediterranean deployment, where I was a supervisor of the modular repair work center, and had 20 men working for me.

My tours of duty include, after basic training in Great Lakes, a school for electronics in Memphis; a 3-year tour in Antisubmarine Squadron 27, followed by a tour in Aircraft Early Warning Wing 12, then advanced electronics training again in Memphis, then a tour in Aircraft Early Warning Squadron 122 aboard the U.S.S. *Independence,* and two tours at the Naval Air Station at Norfolk.

I have been in the Navy for 21 years, I am 38 years old, and I'm married for 19 years, to the same woman, and have four children, two boys and two girls. My oldest son is 18, and a freshman at Old Dominion University, majoring in computer science.

Mr. EDGAR. Thank you very much. Mr. Bauer?

Mr. BAUER. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Heckler. My name is Walter Bauer, I'm a nuclear trained chief interior communications electrician. I'm assigned to the U.S.S. *Spadefish.* I've been in the Navy for 11 years.

My tours of duty include basic training and Interior Communications A School in San Diego. I was on board the U.S.S. *Severn* for 5 months. I attended Nuclear Power School at Bainbridge, Md., and Boston Spa, N.Y., at Basic Submarine School in New London.

I spent 5 years onboard the U.S.S. *James K. Polk,* a 3-year tour at nuclear power training unit at Boston Spa, as an instructor, and now my present tour. I have operated equipment associated with the propulsion plant of nuclear powerplants, and I was an instructor for students to do the same. I currently have 12 men working for me in my division. Onboard a fleet ballistic submarine, I made seven patrols out of Rota, Spain. I reported to my present command in the Mediterranean and completed 2 months, the last 2 months of a 5-month deployment.

I'm 31 years old, I've been married for 9 years, I have two children, ages 7 and 5.

Mr. EDGAR. Thank you. Mr. Huffman, how many years have you been in the service?

Mr. HUFFMAN. Eleven years. I was in once, got out for 10 years and then came back in.

Mr. EDGAR. You're a reenlistee?

Mr. HUFFMAN. I'm what is called a retread. [Laughter.]

Mr. EDGAR. Tell us why you came back.

Mr. HUFFMAN. The last 4 years that I was on the outside, the work that I was in, it was in the construction field, highway and pipeline, and come October every year, I was laid off until spring.

So, I got tired of being laid off, and I told the wife, "I know where there is a job where there's no layoffs, no strikes, and we can plan the paycheck," and so I came back in.

Mr. **Edgar**. Mr. Stewart, you've been in for 21 years, so I think you have the senior number of years of anyone on the panel at this point. You also mentioned that you have a child who is a freshman at a university.

One of the major provisions of this bill contains the option to transfer the entitlement. There is a little technical problem in this provision in that it would be granted only to personnel in critical skills at this point. We are weighing the question whether it should be for everybody. Do you think that having a transferability provision of GI educational benefits between the 8th and 12th year could act as a retention incentive and also provide some benefit to people like yourself who have been in for a long time?

Mr. **Stewart**. Not at that too soon a period of time. If I may elaborate on that?

Mr. **Edgar**. Sure.

Mr. **Stewart**. The majority of the men, like I have 20 men working for me, after they come in around 17, 18, 19 years of age, an initial enlistment for 4 years. After that, they find out the glamor isn't what it was meant to be, as far as that commercial goes on TV—you know, it's an adventure, not just a job.

When that wears off, they think about getting out. They're usually about 22, 23, or 24 years old. The Government dangles a $10,000 to $12,000 check in front of them. That's all they think about is the money.

They will take that money and say, "Fine, I'll stay for another 6 years," which makes them about 28, 29, or 30 years old. Usually, by that time, they are married, have a wife, two or three children, and they are concerned about just being Mr. America, you know, take care of the car payment, the house payment, and so forth. The children are 2 and 3 years old, not too old, so education is still further away, something they read about in the paper, they are not concerned with it.

Then they are hooked, more or less; "OK, I've got a dependable job, I'm a second or first class, good amount of money. Now, in order to get out, if I'm not in a critical career field, I'd probably have to start from scratch on another job—construction, labor, whatever," and they think about those things. And they say, "Well, I'd better do 2 or 3 more years and get settled."

And then they get about my age, where I say I've got 16 years in, I might as well go ahead and finish it out. Then my children are graduated, and whether to go to college. That's another expense you have to think about.

I would say, initially, the first 10 years obligated service, I would say let them have the same GI bill benefits we have for the Vietnam era now, where if a guy decides to get out after 10 or 12 years, he can get a college education. Let him finish 20 years approximately, and if he decides to stay for 30, rate it where, OK, you're going to stay 30 years—I'm never going to use a GI bill myself, but I would——

Mr. **Stewart**. Excuse me—another 10, for a total of 30 years. I would never use a GI bill myself because I've got my education and training, but I would love to transfer it to my children, or dependent spouse or whatever, and let them take advantage of it.

Now, how you could set it up, prorate it like we do the retirement system, for 2½ months—2.5 percent—well, 50-percent payraise after 20 years, for each year you would spend after 20 years. Have it set up similar to that so that if he'd stay for the whole 30 years, he'd have 4 years of college education he could transfer to his dependent. But, initially, the 10 to 12 years, I don't find that a great incentive as far as education benefits go, with the men that I have worked with and talked to, and I have counseled because they come to me every day. That's part of my job to try to keep the quality people in.

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you. Mr. Lowe, you have, if I understand my notes right, a Purple Heart from Vietnam and service in Vietnam, and 14 years of service within the military.

Mr. **Lowe**. Yes, sir.

Mr. **Edgar**. Do you think that an education bill similar to the Vietnam education bill would be helpful as a recruitment and retention measure?

Mr. **Lowe**. It might possibly be for somebody that's just coming in, but like for myself, in 6 years, plan on retiring and, at that point and stage, I already have what I want out of life. If it could be possible or feasible to transfer it to my wife or my children, I think that would be the best way to set it up, but I hate to see anybody lose what they've already worked for.

Mr. **Edgar**. So, you would see it as a benefit that after a particular period of time, Mr. Stewart says 20 years, let's take the period of 12 years, that you could transfer it to your wife and family because you've already gotten your skills?

Mr. **Lowe**. Yes, sir.

Mr. **Edgar**. I have one other question that I'd like to ask all of the panelists, and then I will yield to my colleague.

What really bugs you about the All-Volunteer Force at this point? What kind of gets to you? What are the kinds of things that you see getting to other people within the military, that drives them to say, "I've had enough of this, I've just got to get out."

Mr. Huffman, do you want to take that one on first?

Mr. **Huffman**. Well, the one thing that bugs me the most is these young kids coming in today that can't read, and we have to sit down and teach them how to read before we can give them a technical manual or put them on a job. I've run into that about three times now in the last couple of years; actually had to sit down and teach the kid how to read.

Mr. **Edgar**. Mr. Bauer, what gets at you sometimes when you think about staying in the All-Volunter Force?

Mr. **Bauer**. Personally, I've already crossed the point of making a decision to stay for 20 years or not. When I was first starting out and starting through school, as far as the nuclear power field, there were very few people that had not gone to college. There were not many degrees. Guys dropped out for lack of money, maybe they partied too much, or whatever. I was an instructor up to about 1 year ago. There were very, very few people that had even gone to school.

It's a technical field. There's a lot of—because a guy is an electrician, he still has to understand how a turbine works; and for the machinist's mate who takes care of steam systems, he has to know a little bit of electronics along with it, not in detail but to understand it. It makes it very hard to instill the knowledge in a person, in a young person coming in, the average person, to make it through, and it just makes everyone else's job that much harder. The quality of people, how easily they will learn something, isn't—doesn't seem like it is the same as what it was 7 years ago, or 8 years ago.

Mr. **Edgar**. Mr. Dmochowski.

Mr. **Dmochowski**. The question, again, was about what——

Mr. **Edgar**. What bugs you within the military at this point.

Mr. **Dmochowski**. Not necessarily referring to just the All-Volunteer Force, or whether there would be a draft, or whatever, I guess my main complaint about the military, itself—my field—I'm also nuclear power, and it is one of the critical rates and, therefore, my sea-to-shore rotation is like 5 years and 3 years.

Now, when I spend a year at sea, I will spend at least 75 percent of that time at sea, itself, and when I am in port, once every 3 days, I have to spend 24 hours onboard. So, it is very taxing on my time. As far as personal life, it just about eliminates all personal life.

As far as educational benefits go, trying to use my educational benefits while in the Navy makes it very difficult also because of my operating schedule.

Mr. **Edgar**. We are thinking about adding to the legislation a leave-of-absence provision allowing certain service personnel to take a leave from the service get an education and come back to active duty. Some people feel that that would be an attractive incentive. It would take you out of the rotation for that leave of absence.

Mr. **Dmochowski**. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. **Edgar**. Mr. Stewart?

Mr. **Stewart**. The Navy had a program called ADCOMP where they had that program. You would go to a local university for 2 years, and get an associates degree. They had a few takers, but it wasn't an incentive to keep anybody in because, normally, after they got that education, they got out after the next enlistment was up anyway.

Mr. **Edgar**. Mr. Grant?

Mr. **Grant**. Yes. I'd just like to say that I agree with the quality of personnel. I joined almost 10 years ago, as an alternate of going into the Army, looking for education in the Navy. I've gotten almost all the education I need. Right now, I have no plans of going to college, to get a degree of any type.

I've had job offers up to $28,000 a year, but at this time I feel I enjoy the Navy and working with these young people and trying to develop a higher degree of education in them prior to sending them out to the community.

Mr. **Edgar**. Very good. My colleague from Massachusetts, Mrs. Heckler?

Mrs. **Heckler**. It seems to me that some of you are saying that—the earlier panel said that the educational benefits were an inducement to service. At this point, Mr. Stewart has said that he does not believe that the time frame is correct for the transferability of benefits, or for the creation of eligibility for educational benefits because it comes too early. Is that correct, Mr. Stewart?

Mr. **Stewart**. Yes; you have two options, you dangle money and college, and everybody thinks about money; education is secondary.

From my experience, education hasn't come about until later in their life because like me they took the career field. I will never use mine. I'm trying to debate now—I'm going to retire this October, whether to use it or just go ahead and get a job for $18,000, at one particular company. I've had offers, but they were told to wait until I had 180 days left before they contacted me.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Well, then, that would suggest to me that perhaps we should create the transferability of educational benefits as an inducement to the person who might have already served for 20 years. At that point, he or she would have children who would be in the college age bracket, and that might be the inducement for that extra 10 years rather than the inducement for the choice of making the military a career. Would you think that was preferable?

Mr. **Stewart**. I would because, nowadays, new aircraft are coming out, weapons systems are more sophisticated. A person can't come in and learn it in 2 or 3 years. It takes that long just to be familiar with it.

I work with computer operator test equipment. I get the more highly skilled people coming in working for me. I understand the problems these other gentlemen have spoken about. I have encountered it in my other collateral duties, but the men that specifically work for me, they are above average in intelligence.

They come in, learn, go to school, get the basic training, and then its on-the-job training for a year or two, learn the system and then they get right out. I've had a first class with 6 years in, get out, and come back in and work for me a week later, making 2½ times what he was making in the Navy, doing the same job as a technical representative for a company. That's the problem that I have.

Education is the last thing on their minds. Now, these other particular rates where they aren't so critical, it may be an inducement.

Mrs. **Heckler**. The companies that offer higher salaries and better terms to Navy personnel, are they companies that do business with the Government?

Mr. **Stewart**. Yes; most business has some contract or contact with the Government in some form or other, yes.

Mrs. **Heckler**. What would you think of our placing in a bill, a prohibition against joining a company that did business with the Governnent for a period of, say, 2 or 3 years after leaving the service. Would that stem the hemorrhage of competent skilled personnel?

Mr. **Stewart**. No; I don't, because they say if that's the case, where they can get right out after they get it, and if you would check on something like that, they would say, "Well, I didn't know anything about it. As far as I know, I just got the job."

Mrs. **Heckler.** Well, you would put the penalties on the company because they are pirating the military personnel after the U.S. Government trains these people.

Mr. **Stewart.** Yes; that has come up. The Governnent still needs these new systems but they don't have enough trained people on their own to get it. One of the inducements that these companies have is, "I will give you a college education if you work for me for *x* number of years," which is the same thing that you are offering me, and I don't have to put up with going away from my family for 9 months out of a year. I can do that locally and then work for the company.

So, the only thing that you would have to offer me in the military would be the transferability of my educational benefits that I would never use because I don't need it. I don't have a degree per se, but I've got a skill that is marketable and in demand.

Mrs. **Heckler.** Well, perhaps the way to handle this would be to impose a penalty on the companies. If they want to hire a skilled military person who has developed a trade and ability at the U.S. taxpayers' expense, then they can make a compensation to the U.S. taxpayer, the U.S. Treasury, $5,000 for this skill, $10,000 for that skill. What would you think of that?

Mr. **Stewart.** I might cut my own throat. [Laughter.]

Mr. **Huffman.** Sounds good, but who's going to pay?

Mrs. **Heckler.** Well, we do have means of making people pay. I'd like to ask one other question about this issue of correspondence classes because, in our testimony in Washington, we've heard a lot of testimony on the question of correspondence courses, how valuable they are to the military. Would anybody like to comment on that?

Mr. **Huffman.** I've already done 28 correspondence courses through the Navy, Navy correspondence courses, and I've taken several PACE courses, which is program assistance college education, where they have an instructor come aboard ship.

The PACE program, I believe, is an outstanding program. We had a good turnout on it on the *Newport,* so I've already taken world history, English, literature, and bookkeeping. I'm also working as a divisional career counselor, to try to encourage people to take advantage of these opportunities. It helps out with their college education if they decide to get out and go to college.

Some of the things that I've seen and been told, especially with the new education system that they have now, the VEAP, a lot of people who do use it, I would say, at least 80 percent of them use it as a savings account. I have also encountered one person who believed that if he put money into it, the Government was going to give him $2 for every $1 that he put into it, when he got discharged. It took a while to straighten that boy out.

Mrs. **Heckler.** Do you use the GI bill to pay for your courses?

Mr. **Huffman.** I used the GI bill when I was out. I went to electronics school at Cleveland Institute of Electronics, night school for 3 years, picked up my electronics technician's certificate, and I also hold a certificate in FCC, but I let my FCC license expire because I don't need it in the Navy.

One thing I would like on this transferability, I like that clause because my oldest daughter will be graduating from high school at the age of 15½.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Congratulations, that is remarkable.

Mr. **Huffman**. She wants to go to college, and I told her if I could get the money, we'd work on it I would like, instead of waiting too long or further down the road, to incorporate a transferability clause. I would like to see it come a little bit earlier because my oldest one is in that position where she could have her masters degree at the age of 21. My youngest one is in the same boat.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Well, I'm sure she would be able to qualify for a scholarship, and she should be motivated to do that. I would not wait for the passage of this legislation, although I am optimistic about it. No further questions.

Mr. **Edgar**. Gwen Perry?

Ms. **Perry**. Thank you. I did have one question for this group. You would fall into a category that I heard a great deal from. I had the pleasure of visiting one of our nuclear subs and, boy, I'm telling you, they don't make enough money to put me on one of those. That's some duty.

As I talked to the gentlemen on that ship, a number of them expressed concern over the fact that in 1989, the deadline is up for the use of the original GI bill. Most of you would have probably come in and qualified for that bill; if not yourselves, among the men you are talking with, are you getting any feedback from those people who will be leaving the service in order to take advantage of the bill before the 1989 deadline?

We also have some legislation pending and are looking at possible additional language or amendments to extend that deadline. Any feedback on that, from anybody who would care to address it?

Mr. **Stewart**. Most of the men I've talked to would like that date extended indefinitely, because they feel they are putting a rush on them to the sense that, "Well, I have to get out now or I'm going to lose it."

Ms. **Perry**. We're talking about your career midlevel people, the ones in those critical skills that have that ability to train and teach the young people as they come in.

Mr. **Stewart**. Yes. Normally, when they're on active duty, they have a tuition aid program, that pays 90 percent of their tuition. Nowadays if they are on shore duty, they can afford to take two or three classes at night and get it in a 2- or 3-year period. In order to get a degree, it would probably require full time, and they can't get it while they are in the Navy, so they would have to get out and get it. That's one of the problems they have. They get an associates degree through the dantes and cut programs. In order to get a full BS degree, they have to be on campus and go for another 2 years, and that's where the problem arises in the sense that this other program that they don't have, where you get a leave of absence to go to this college, you have to get out to get it. And that's some debate that's come up with that.

Mr. **Edgar**. Any other questions?

Ms. **Perry**. That's fine. Thank you.

Mr. **Edgar**. Before we move to our next panel, I want to thank all of you. Do you have any questions for us on anything that you might be curious about at this point?

Mr. **Dmochowski**. Why are they having this 1989 cutoff, as far as the GI bill goes?

Mr. **Edgar**. The 1989 cutoff was included in the initial legislation to terminate the Vietnam era GI bill. It is calculated at 10 years plus 4 years after the termination date. It [illegible] under a 10-year delimiting date, and 1989 would be the end of that 10-year period.

We think that with the enactment of H.R. 1400, or some version of it, those who stay for 3 years would get benefits, probably more benefits, under H.R. 1400, or at least somewhat comparable benefits. We may have to put language in as a buffer between the new GI bill and the termination of the old GI bill. But it is very difficult for a Federal agency to administer such a program. It may seem simple, but it is very difficult for them to run two programs at the same time, or to maintain dual systems. It gets very confusing as to who qualifies for what.

Our hope is that whatever we do this bill will contain the future GI education bill and benefits program. We will either "grandfather" people in under the old program or we will have some kind of buffer to protect people so that you don't have the drain of people who want to leave now to avoid loss of their benefits. Over the next couple of years there will be a number of people who will say, "I'm going to get out so I can start using those benefits." The closer you get to the 1989 deadline without a new bill in place, the more pressure there will be to get out and use it.

Any other questions or comments?

[No response.]

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you, again, for coming. We appreciate your taking the time. We will move to our third panel of witness. As we move through the panels, we may be a little quicker with panel presentations only because a lot of ground has already been covered.

Before you begin, I'd like to yield to my colleague from Massachusetts who is going to make just a brief statement.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my apologies to the panel and the ensuing panels because this happens to be the centennial birthday of Wellsley, Mass., my hometown, and because there are not many flights from Norfolk to Boston, I am going to have to leave perhaps in the middle of the testimony here, but I want to assure all of the witnesses in the forthcoming panels and this one, that I will study the transcript very, very carefully. I have special apologies to the Air Force because I am only hearing from the Navy today, but I want you to know that all of your testimony will be taken into account. Were it not for the fact that this is a very, very rare event in the history of this community, I would not be leaving. Thank you.

Mr. **Edgar**. Very good. We will look forward to working with you on the hearing in Massachusetts.

Gentlemen, I want to thank you for coming and being willing to present your views and ideas. All of you have heard the previous comments and concerns. We'd like each of you to introduce yourself with a brief comment about yourself, and then if you have a comment you'd like to make on any of the questions that have been raised previously, either about the GI bill as a recruitment incentive or retention incentive, or the transferability issue, or the leave-of-absence issue, please feel free to do so. If you want to respond to the issue of what bugs you within the All-Volunteer Service, feel free to do that too. Why don't we hear from each of you down the line. If you want to make a comment on any of those questions at that time, you may, and then we will move to questions. Mr. Smith?

STATEMENTS OF A PANEL CONSISTING OF LT. COMDR. JACK SMITH, LT. KEVIN STONE, LT. COMDR. TERRY ETNYRE, ENS. ROBERT PLETL, JR., AND LT. COMDR. ROBERT KISSINGER, ALL OF THE U.S. NAVY

Mr. **Smith**. My name is Lt. Comdr. Jack Smith. I've been in the Navy approximately 12 years. Presently, I'm in a helicopter squadron, HSL–34, and it's an ASW helicopter that goes on board of frigates or small surface ships, in single bird detachments. I've been with that same community for my entire tour in the Navy. This is my fourth squadron tour except for one tour at Naval Post Graduate School, where I picked up my masters degree.

I've made two deployments to the Mediterranean and one to northern Europe. I've been married for 11 years and I have two daughters.

I think the only comment that sort of bugged me since I've been sitting in and listening, I think I sort of have to agree with Chief Stewart. I think if you give a person up to the 6-year point quite a sum of money, I'd be afraid that I'd be losing people at the 6-year point. I think that is the point in time when the Navy and all the military has to maintain or retain those people. Perhaps the transferability will pick up the burden there and keep them on, but that would be an area that I would really be concerned about, that 6- to 12-year point where they've gained all that expertise that we're looking to hang onto.

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you very much. Mr. Stone?

Mr. **Stone**. Good morning. I'm Lt. Kevin Stone, I'm currently on the U.S.S. *Hammerhead*, a nuclear submarine homeported here in Norfolk. I've been in the Navy 10 years, enlisted in 1971 and received a Secretary of the Navy appointment to the Naval Academy. After graduating in 1976, I went on to Nuclear Power School and further nuclear training. I've been on the *Hammerhead* for 3 years, during which time I've been reactor controls officer, sonar officer, assistant weapons officer, and presently operations department head.

I made a 6-month Mediterranean deployment, and a 3-month independent deployment to the North Atlantic. I am 27 years old, have been married for 5 years, and have no children. I will be leaving the Navy in July.

I think the major issue is that we need to get, as the commander said, something to hold a person at the 6- to 12-year point. At 6 years, people I've had working for me, such as my reactor operators, have been lured away by the nuclear power industry which, I believe, is well over 50 percent Navy trained. Sonarmen are offered jobs on the ship by IBM, which made the submarine's sonar equipment. I don't think any amount of penalty paid by a company will deter them, we will just end up paying more on the other end for the equipment.

Transferability has been talked about on my ship. People like a radioman chief would like to transfer something to his wife, something to his children. And also another major issue is the 1989 deadline date.

There are people onboard who say, "Well, I'm going to have to leave, and then maybe I'll come back in after I've taken my 4 years and gotten my degree."

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you very much. I don't agree with my colleague in terms of the penalties on industry, but coming up in the plane, we jokingly talked about moving into a baseball system where we'd get three future draft choices. [Laughter.]

Let me hear from Mr. Etnyre.

Mr. **Etnyre**. Good morning, Chairman Edgar, Mrs. Heckler. I'm Lt. Comdr. Terry Etnyre, currently serving as the engineer officer aboard the U.S.S. *Mississippi*, nuclear-powered guided-missile cruiser.

I've been in the Navy for approximately 10 years. After commissioning, I served for 2 years as a damage control assistant onboard the destroyer escort *Hammondburg*. Following that, I had a year of nuclear power training, and 3 years as repair officer aboard U.S.S. *Enterprise*.

I've had shore tours on the staff of the Naval Reactors Facility and Nuclear Power Training Unit at Idaho Falls, followed by an 8-month tour at the Surface Warfare Officer Department Head Course. Aboard the *Mississippi*, I supervise 225 officers and men, and am directly responsible for the maintenance, operations, and training of the two nuclear propulsion plants.

I have been married for 11 years; I have two children, 10 and 7.

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you.

Mr. **Etnyre**. I have one comment I'd like to make about the 8- to 12-year point, as far as the transferability. One thing, I think, that people lose sight of is how much a spouse lends to keeping an individual in the service, whether that is the husband or the wife. It is certainly much easier for any service member to remain in the service if he has a happy homelife.

About the 8- to 12-year point is when most of the children are grown and attending schools themselves, and that frees up the time for the spouse who would be available to use the benefits, the educational benefits. Certainly from the officer corps standpoint, very few of us would ever have a reason to use the college education benefits that would be a part of this bill.

Also, from the sidelight of, again, the penalties for stealing trained personnel from the Navy, or any branch of the service, you have to realize that the reason a lot of people come in the service out of high school is to get some training. If you bring them in and give them training and then penalize them, or the companies who want to hire them when they get out, you may definitely be hurting at the 4- to 6-year point, or even earlier; you wouldn't have people who would want to come in at all.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt there?

Mr. **Edgar**. Sure.

Mrs. Heckler. First of all, I'm not proposing penalties, I'm suggesting ideas. I think that really isn't it possible that if we had some system which would make it less simple for outside industry to really raid the best trained personnel from the military, would we, at that point, not attract people who really went in the military for a career.

What we are trying to draft in Congress is a bill that will attract qualified, able people and retain them in the military to serve the country. If we are attracting people to the military to develop skills that serve for a very short period of years, we are not meeting our basic goal of attracting people for a long period of time. Isn't it possible that if we dealt with the hemorrhaging by private industry, in one way or another, that we would perhaps get down to appealing to people who are looking at the military as a career for 20 years or more?

Mr. Etnyre. Well, I think you have to consider the group of people you are trying to entice. You are talking to 18-year-olds right out of high school. They are not looking 20 years down the road. They are looking today, tomorrow, maybe 4 years from now.

I spend a lot of time attempting to retain my people in the department, in the nuclear power field, and I talk with them in some detail and, across the board, the reason that each one of them did come in the service was for some training.

Now, they are at the 6-year, 8-year point, depending on the types of extensions or reenlistments that they've agreed to, and they are looking at getting out. The reason that they are getting out now is for college benefits in a lot of cases, to take advantage of the 1989 expiration that was discussed in detail here already, but they are looking for something to benefit them initially when they come in, short term; they are not looking long term. They might be looking at pay, they may be looking at monetary benefits of some sort, but they are not looking down the pike to a 20- or 30-year career.

Mr. Edgar. I think that's a helpful point. You are saying that penalties may hurt recruitment if someone knows that if they come in and get trained, they could be penalized for leaving the service and going to work for military-industrial complex. If that is the case they might not ever come in at all.

Mr. Etnyre. Yes, sir.

Mr. Edgar. That's a helpful point. Let's go to our next panelist, and then we will get back to specific questions. Please identify yourself.

Mr. Pletl. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Mrs. Heckler. I'm Ensign Robert Pletl, Jr., and I'm from Sauquoit, N.Y., and I'm currently assigned to the U.S.S. *Newport*, a landing ship, tank, 1179, as an information center officer.

I have been in the Navy now for 10 years. My tours of duty have included, after basic training at Great Lakes, Damage Control A School at Philadelphia, Pa., and 2½-year tour of duty aboard the U.S.S. *Nagzubi*, AOG 56, following which I attended Nuclear Power School at Bainbridge, Md., and Prototype at West Milton, N.Y.

I was then assigned to the U.S.S. *Dixon* AS 37, followed by duty on the U.S.S. *Pollack* SSN 603. I was selected for the Navy's enlisted scientific and education program, and obtained a bachelor's degree at Purdue University.

I have attended officers candidate school and surface warfare officers school at Newport, R.I., where I was also a member of the staff at the Naval War College, Division Center for War Games.

I have made two Med cruises, one of a 6-month deployment and one of 7 months, and have just returned from a 6-month overseas deployment to the North Atlantic, Mediterranean, and Indian Ocean.

I am 31 years old, I have two children, ages 4 and 1, and I've been married now for 8½ years.

Mr. **Edgar**. Would you like to comment on any of the questions before we move to the final panelist and questions?

Mr. **Pletl**. Yes, sir. The current problem I have in my division right now is that I am seriously lacking midlevel trained personnel. I find that by the time I train these personnel to fill these billets they are enticed by outside jobs that pay them more, plus have the added benefit that they don't go to sea any longer, so the boys no longer have to be part-time fathers and husbands.

I am handicapped further by the fact that who I get to replace these trained personnel are, of course, new recruits have to be completely trained. I don't feel that the way we are doing it right now to hold them is working because the enticement that they get on the outside is the fact that somebody is offering them more money and a much more stable job, and you can't penalize the companies, it's a free country. That's what we're here for.

Mr. **Edgar**. OK. Any other comment?

Mr. **Pletl**. No, sir.

Mr. **Edgar**. Mr. Kissinger, you're not related to the former Secretary of State, are you? [Laughter.]

Mr. **Kissinger**. No, sir.

Mr. **Edgar**. OK. Mr. Kissinger?

Mr. **Kissinger**. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Mrs. Heckler. My name is Lt. Comdr. Robert Kissinger, and I'm currently stationed aboard the U.S.S. *Farragut*. Chief Grant works for me.

I've been aboard about 6 months now. I met the ship in Athens, Greece during her last deployment to the Persian Gulf and Mediterranean. After commissioning in 1970 I was stationed aboard the U.S.S. *Perry* DD 844. I was then officer in charge of a fast patrol boat with Coastal Division 21. At that time, I went to Department Head School, prior to becoming weapons officer aboard the U.S.S. *Downs* FF1070. I then spent 3 years as operational test director for the Tomahawk cruise missile program, with Operational Test Evaluation Forces in the Pacific, and then joined the U.S.S. *Farragut* in Athens this year.

I am 32 years old. I am married. I have two children, both daughters, ages 4 and 8. During my last shore duty tour, I used the GI bill to get my masters degree from Southern Illinois University, using about 28 months of my 36 months time.

As far as comments go, I have to agree with most of the gentlemen who have previously spoken. My youngest daughter is getting ready to go to school full time next year, and my wife has been looking forward ever since we married 10 years ago, to getting her masters degree, and returning to teaching. I would like for her to do that. Even with the salary raise that we've had, I would be strapped, with maintaining a home and with inflation, to send her full time to school. Being able to transfer the remainder of my benefits to her or to my children when they get a little older would be a great incentive. I think these senior panel members, lieutenant commanders, probably, as they said, would not use their benefits in the future, but my being able to transfer over would definitely keep me around.

As for eligibility, in 1989, when the GI bill runs out, I will have 1 year left in the military. So, if I decide to go 20 years, I would find myself having done 20 years and no benefits left, even if I had not used mine. So I think it is extremely important for everybody who was on the old bill to get the date extended.

As far as junior personnel onboard, I'm running into the same problem everybody else is. I have 102 people working for me. Many of them are skilled technicians, and the majority of them, from second or first class, are saying, "I've got 6 years in now, or 7 years." They know they can get better jobs on the outside. A lot of them stay around for personal reasons, or because they enjoy their jobs, but a lot of them simply want to get an education.

If you can get a leave of absence for them, let them serve their 6 years and say, "OK, we will give you a leave of absence for 4 years to get your degree, if you will then serve 6 or 8 years, after you come back in, either in the officers program or as a senior enlisted." Or maybe you could give them an advancement to chief if they are first class after they get the higher education. At that time, you may have 14 to 15 years in, and the likelihood is they will stay around for the last 6 or 7 years, and possibly for another 17 to 30.

This way, they are getting the education they want, and you're going to retain the people that you need most—right now, the middle grade petty officers. The Navy is short 30,000.

I don't think we have too much of a problem right now recruiting people to stay in for 4 years or 3 years. I think people are coming in. The money is looking better. The way the economy is on the outside, people I've got coming don't talk education. They say, "I can't get a job on the outside, I'll come in for 4." As they were saying, money speaks right at the beginning, but as they get in the military a little longer, they start families, they start thinking about education and making a little better lifestyle. If you give them a leave of absence and let them get that advanced degree, I think you'll find a lot more of them are going to stay around. After 20 years, many of them are only 40 years old. They know that unless they've got that degree, they have no chance in competing in the outside market with the 22 and 23 year old straight out of college. But if they do have that degree, they have something to work with. Thank you.

Mr. **Edgar**. That's particularly helpful. I guess my question to the panel, particularly this panel, is that if you were a Congressperson elected to serve for 2 years, serving on Veterans' Committee, but with interest in all of the areas we have talked about, and you were asked to write a bill to do the kinds of things we are attempting to do. What kind of ingredients would be in your bill? What kind of benefit levels?

Mr. Kissinger pointed out that he would have in his bill, if he were a Congressperson, a leave of absence provision.

What would you do in drafting a piece of legislation?

Who wants to take that one on? That is a tough one.

Lieutenant **Stone**. I think one thing we need to do is make sure he can go to a good college and that we are offering enough monetary compensation that he is not going to be going to the local community college, or even a State college. If somebody wants to go to, say, Harvard and pick up a business degree, say a supply officer, he can do that. He's not going to be stuck—not necessarily stuck with a degree, but have a degree that is not worth as much.

Mr. **Edgar**. Several of the bills that are introduced—this one doesn't happen to have that provision; a tuition benefit—but some witnesses before our subcommittee were making the point that unless you have a tuition incentive, those who go to the higher priced schools would have difficulty on the limited benefits that are provided here.

I have to admit that one of the only reasons the chairman of the full committee, Sonny Montgomery did not put the tuition incentive in this particular legislation was the cost. I come from an area of suburban Philadelphia that has places like the University of Pennsylvania, Drexel, Villanova, and Swarthmore College. I really wonder about the old GI bill where benefits were given and people had a great deal of difficulty making ends meet if they went to any one of those universities. If someone was going to California schools, or New York schools, or others, where there were free benefits or minimal tuition benefits, they were able to use their GI bill and get quite an adequate education.

I think the point you make is well taken. I believe it is important to have enough money up front within the bill, either in tuition, or in monthly benefits to provide the flexibility of going to some of the better schools. Is that the point you were making?

Lieutenant **Stone**. Yes.

Mr. **Edgar**. What other ingredients would you draft?

Ensign **Pletl**. Sir, if I may answer that.

I went back to the ship Friday and I talked to some of the officers and enlisted men about some of the proposals. The answer that I got back from most of the people was "let's keep the old GI bill, but add to it the transferability clause." It was pointed out to me by some of the senior enlisted that they have learned a skill in the Navy, they have attended their schools and they can market themselves on the outside.

But when you have a man that is approaching 20 years in the Navy, he has usually acquired a family by then and his elder children are approaching college age. This is an additional incentive to people that would make the Navy a career because, I think, career pattern people sort of acquire family about their second or third reenlistment.

Most of the people I talked to just like the old bill, sir. And they want to continue using it. I am in such a position right now, as are several of my fellow officers, that if I want to use the rest of my GI bill, I have to get out of the Navy before I can finish my 20 years.

I don't like that choice.

Mr. **Edgar**. Let me just follow up on your comment. You advocate the old GI bill, plus the transferability clause. The difference between the old GI bill and this new GI bill that we are writing is the two-step process. You get minimal benefits if you leave after 3 years and you get larger benefits if you leave after 6 years.

Someone made the comment this morning that the cutoff probably should be the seventh year, so that you get them and retain them for that next period of time.

What problems would you have with the two-step approach, benefits after 3 years, but smaller benefits than you would get if you stayed for 6?

Ensign Pletl. I don't see a problem with that, sir. But I don't really think it is going to work because most of the people you would keep past their 6-year point aren't kept, as the other members said, because of the educational benefits they will acquire later, but are kept by the reenlistment bonuses.

I kept one of my third-class petty officers only because of the fact that we arranged for him to get $16,000 to stay for 6 more years. On top of that, we arranged for him to have 3 years ashore. That is the only thing that kept him. He could care less what kind of educational benefits at that point he was going to get.

Mr. Edgar. Well, unfortunately, I don't have any responsibility in terms of drafting legislation in that area, if I did, I think it would be helpful information to figure out what the best pay incentives for retention really should be, and how much flexibility you should have regarding reenlistment bonuses.

My jurisdiction is in the area of education. We are trying to see whether or not a two-step approach—and it can be two step, not necessarily in this fashion; it could be 4 years and 8 years, but the two-step approach nevertheless. But the two-step approach being a little extra incentive, if you are going to use this education benefits, we can keep you in for 3 more years. If we keep you in for 3 years more, and after that, for 2 more, here is the transferability benefit you could get.

We are trying to get a sounding as to whether or not that initial idea of two steps, plus transferability makes some common sense.

Mr. Smith. I think the two-step part and the transferability later on is terrific, it is just a matter of the placement.

Mr. Edgar. How would you place it, Mr. Smith, knowing what you know about the service at this point. Where would you put the first step cutoff, the smaller benefits, regardless of what the benefit level is going to be? What would be the second step cutoff and what would be the transferability window, in your opinion?

Mr. Smith. I would have it somewhere, probably, near the 8- to 10-year point, maybe for the second tier. You run into the selective reenlistment bonuses that we are having to give a bonus large enough to offset what they might have gotten, had they gotten out to go to school.

Mr. Edgar. OK. So you would put the second tier between 8 and 10 years, and the first tier around 1 to how many years before you would get the basic benefit?

Mr. Smith. Probably the completion of the first tour, which is typically 4 years of active duty; I guess they all come in under a 6-year obligation program, often 4 years is spent active and 2——

Mr. Edgar. So, it would be after 4 years of service you get 4 years of college, that would be tier No. 1. Tier No. 2 would kick in after the second 4 years of duty?

Mr. **Smith**. Yes, sir, something like that. And then you have other things to draw them after that—transferability, even if you get them past the 10-year point, of course the lure of retirement, 20-year retirement.

Mr. **Edgar**. What year would you begin the transferability?

Mr. **Smith**. Probably another hitch, or the 12-year point, or something.

Mr. **Edgar**. Does anyone else want to comment, or backup and change those year dates.

Mr. **Etnyre**. I would like to say that I think the bill that you have talked about and the ideas that you have are all basically good. The tuition cost, as Lieutenant Stone said, is very important. There has to be ability for them to go to school.

As for the two-step approach, I think I would be in favor of a 6-year for the first step and after that, around the 8- to 10-year point, as Commander Smith was mentioning.

Mr. **Edgar**. So, you would make them stay 6 years before they got any GI education?

Mr. **Etnyre**. Yes, sir. We train them and give them schools as an incentive for the initial enlistment, 6-year obligated of some sort, whether it is 4 years active and 2 years reserve is the initial incentive. That would be an incentive for them to stay an additional 2 years in order to help fill the E–4, E–5 gap that we sometimes run into.

Mr. **Edgar**. Let me see if I can summarize. You say 1 to 6 for the first tier and after 8 years they get the second tier?

Mr. **Etnyre**. Yes, sir.

Mr. **Edgar**. And when would you begin to get transferability of benefits?

Mr. **Etnyre**. Well, looking at the transferability, give it for a 4-year period initially, to 12 years as the one we have heard initially. That is a very small window, 4 years. I don't know if there were any provisions in the bill to say that if I would transfer that to my spouse or my children, that if they started and I was at the 10-year point when they started, would they be able to continue the full 4-years, or would they have to cram it all into 2?

Now, it would have to be wide enough to allow a 4-year use. I am thinking, I guess, more in terms of the old GI bill, which I did come in under; and that is where my prejudices lie at this point.

Mr. **Edgar**. I am told by counsel that he can transfer his benefits after the eighth year, and the benefits accrue as long as he is on active duty, and up to 10 years after active duty.

So, if you are in the 13th year, 14th year, 15th year, you can also transfer and you leave at the end of 20 years, and you have 10 more years of transferability options.

Mr. **Etnyre**. That takes care of one of the things I was thinking about.

Along with that, I think one grade that we do miss a lot and we have alluded to them here, and that is the midtermer, the guy that is at the 10- or 12-year point. Not only providing transferability, certainly that would help, but provide a means especially for the sailor to take advantage of the bill, 9-month deployments, 8-month deployments, three-section duty in port does not lend itself to going to night school; nor does a 5-years sea and 3-years shore rotation lend itself to go to night school, especially when some of the shore duty that some of the people draw doesn't allow for any kind of regular working hours.

So, there has to be some means for the serviceman to use the GI bill while he is in the service; leave of absence certainly is one.

Mr. **Edgar**. OK. Now, we've got leave of absence and tuition costs. Most agreement on the two-tiered system, a little difference of opinion as to when it should kick in, but longer kick-ins than Congress was going to set in place.

Any other ingredients that you would put in?

Mr. **Kissinger**. Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that I had that I have seen in 11 years. I agree with the 6 year, or around that point eligibility for full benefits. One reason for that is, the way it currently is, about 180 days or whatever, the minimum amount of time under the old GI bill I came in under, we had a lot of people who were getting out with other than full honorable conditions. And yet, we have the young kids that are in for 6 months and these guys getting out after 3, 4, or 5 months, or even 1 year, who have done basically zero for the time they have been in which have caused the officers and the senior petty officers heartaches and yet they are getting out and drawing full benefits.

I think the program ought to be limited to people with honorable discharges. So, if there is anything but honorable, full term, giving them and the other people who do not provide the service they agree to is unfair. They agree to a contract for a certain amount of time, and they have nothing but nonjudicial punishment and problems throughout the military; I don't think these people deserve the benefits. I don't think they ought to get them just because they have done their time, and actually done nothing while they were in to deserve their benefits.

Mr. **Edgar**. That is a helpful point. We put that into the provisions of this bill H.R. 1400 is only for those who receive an honorable discharge.

It is also only for those who are high school graduates. There was some question as to whether or not we ought to allow them to get their high school education under the bill. I guess it was our hope that if they spent 4 years in the service that they could get their high school equivalency. I don't know if that is possible, or not, rather than offering it as a veteran benefit.

Mr. **Kissinger**. I have one other question regarding transferability of benefits. If I wanted to use part of mine, say, 36 months, could I transfer part and use part myself, or when I transfer, do I have to transfer everything?

Mr. **Edgar**. You could transfer part of it.

One question we haven't resolved yet is what if you have two wives. [Laughter.]

I yield to Gwen Perry.

Ms. **Perry**. Also, I would like some comments on time limits. You know, year after year we have had problems with the old GI bill, we had a 10-year time limit on that. Do you all have any comments on the time? Generally, it is felt that you have 10-years after you get out to get an education. You should be able to do it in that amount of time.

Do you have any comments?

Mr. Kissinger. I think there is no problem with 10 years. When I was getting my masters, a captain who just retired was getting his benefits and decided he wanted to go back to school after he got out because he really didn't feel like working and he had the retirement.

I think anybody in 10 years is going to make the decision of whether he is going to use it or not.

Mr. Edgar. OKy. Any other questions?

[No response.]

Mr. Edgar. I want to thank you for your time.

Do you have any other questions of me that you would like to ask before you go on to other things?

Yes, sir?

Mr. Stone. You mentioned something about the critical billets only being eligible for transfer. Ms. Perry said anybody in the submarines. They aren't necessarily all qualified as critical billets. They disappear for 2 or 3 months at a time and don't see daylight—that's critical. And everybody inside, certainly people that are at sea for 9 months on a carrier and only one port stop, that is critical billet, regardless of what they are serving as.

I think everybody should be eligible for transferability.

Mr. Edgar. Yes, I have come to that conclusion, too. I don't know whether I can get support for that in the committee, but I think everybody should receive that benefit. We ought not to set up any kind of discriminatory system. Any arbitrary decision as to who is critical and who is not is in my mind is discriminatory. What is critical? A supply clerk, I think, could be critical to somebody who needs the supplies.

Thank you for your time.

Let's move now to our first Air Force panel.

Gentlemen, thank you for your patience this morning. We ask a lot of questions, but I think we are getting some information that is helpful. You have heard all of the discussions so far, so I think we can cut through a lot of the redtape and repetition.

Let's go down through the line, again, and have you introduce yourself. If you want to comment on any of the questions, or areas that we have covered so far, please feel free to do so in your opening statement.

Let's start with Major Evans.

STATEMENTS OF A PANEL CONSISTING OF MAJ. MIKE EVANS, CAPT. STEVE ANDERSEN, CAPT. DALE HILL, LT. HAROLD HANCOCK, AND CAPT. JOE FACENDA, ALL OF THE U.S. AIR FORCE

Major Evans. Yes, sir, I am Maj. Mike Evans, assigned to First Tactical Fighter Warning, presently working in the Wing Inspection Division. I have an AFSC 1115M, of course, which means primary duty as an F-15 pilot.

In the past I have flown several models of the AF-4, including our reconnaissance version, overseas duty history includes 1974 and 1975 a tour in Thailand, 1978 and 1979 Kadena, Okinawa, Japan. I graduated from the Air Force Academy in 1968 with a B.S. in aeronautical engineering, am presently undergoing some training using the tuition system, trying to save my GI bill benefits for later.

I am 36 years old, married and have 1 child, age 8, a girl.

If I could throw a couple of votes in here for a couple of things that have been talked about, I would think that first of all, any GI bill would of course be a motivation for joining the service. I know that 4-year educational opportunity to go to the Air Force Academy was certainly motivational for me.

The GI bill benefits for follow-up education, of course, were highly motivational for me as well.

The transferability, at the 8- to 12-year point or after each 12 years of service, I think would be a highly desirable feature. But I would be very concerned about trying to tie that, as other members have stated, to any critical skills. Again, critical skills are something I see as a personnel term and a term of convenience, when in reality all we are talking about is a critical manning level. And that, of course, could shift back and forth by the year.

We might consider just for our thought, possibly the Army's problem where we are talking about a 2-year entry program. While it is not particularly my service, I think we need to reward somehow. We neglect the soldier who signs up for a 2-year hitch, because we need those folks, too.

So, I am a little bit concerned about moving the kick-in points downstream too far. We might be looking at a three-tier system, which would further make the question complex.

I would agree with one of the things that has been voiced here. Although we are tying this to an honorable discharge, oftentimes it has been my experience of the 3912, that a person is given an honorable discharge, but hasn't really done much for the service. I might urge perhaps inclusion of some sort of discretionary pattern to the Air Force, although I would really be hardpressed to figure out exactly how to write that in the law.

Mr. EDGAR. Thank you.

Many times there are lots of things I find difficult to write into law, as well. But I appreciate your comments, and your votes have been tallied.

Captain Andersen.

Captain ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am Capt. Steve Andersen. I am presently assigned to the 27th Technical Fighter Squadron. My speciality code is also 1115M, which means I also fly the F-15 at Langley Air Force Base.

After my flight training, I pretty much went to flight training in Georgia and California, followed by operational overseas assignments in Germany, both at Ramstein Air Force Base and Bitburg, flying both the F-4 and the F-15.

I have just gotten back from Europe this past year and I have been stationed at Langley ever since. I am a 1974 graduate of the Air Force Academy. And presently I am pursuing my masters in management in my off-duty time, utilizing my GI bill.

I am presently 28, married with no children.

I would also like to just give my vote, again for the inclusion of the transferability clause. I think, speaking selfishly, that is probably one of the most important factors, because I would like to transfer some of my benefits to my wife.

As far as what Major Evans said, I think it should be tied to an honorable discharge. I think it would be helpful if the services had some kind of discretionary power for people, as he says, who do get honorable discharges, but don't do much for the service.

Mr. **Edgar**. That is a tough question.

Captain Hill?

Captain **Hill**. Yes, sir. I am Capt. Dale Hill. I am currently stationed at Headquarters, Tactical Air Command, at Langley Air Force Base. My current Air Force specialty code is 7321, which means I am a personnel manager. I coordinate and direct worldwide assignments for fighter pilots throughout the Air Force.

I was commissioned through the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps in 1971 and had pilot training at Laredo Air Force Base. From there I went to Vietnam as a forward air controller flying the OB-10 Bronco. I came back from Vietnam to fly the T-38 Talon as an instructor pilot in the Air Training Command at Vance Air Force Base, Okla.

From there I came to the Tactical Air Command flying the A-10 Thunderbolt II, at Myrtle Beach, S.C. I left Myrtle Beach, S.C., this year to come to my present assignment.

I have a masters degree earned through my veterans' benefits and I am 31 years old, I am married, and have a daughter who is 15 months old.

I think a lot about the transferability provision. Right now I am paying 13½ percent on a VA loan on my home and it makes it very difficult for me to put money away for my daughter's education. I look at my contemporaries who are possibly paying half the rate I am on their home loans, and are making probably a comparable salary to me in the civilian market. They are probably able to sock away more money for their dependent's education. So, I think the transferability is really a good selling point.

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you. Any other comments that you want to make at this time?

Captain **Hill**. No, sir.

Mr. **Edgar**. Lieutenant Hancock.

Lieutenant **Hancock**. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, I am Lt. Harold Hancock. I am currently assigned with the 4501st Computer Services Squadron at Langley Air Force Base, Va. My Air Force specialty code is 5131-C and my job involves designing and implementing data bases and support of data processing systems development.

My previous assignments are that I have been at Lackland Air Force Base, Tex., and I have 3 years prior service in the Army, most of that time spent with the 8th Infantry Division in central Germany.

I have a bachelor of science degree in mathematics, I am 31 years old, I am single, and I appreciate the opportunity to be here this morning.

I would like to say that one of the main things which encouraged me to enter the Army at the time that I did was being able to accrue those educational benefits as I worked in the Army. And, of course, I did accrue those benefits and I got out of the Army after 3 years service and used those benefits to go to school. In my particular case those benefits were very important to me at that time.

From what I have heard this morning, and what I have gained from talking with a few people about it in the past, in recent weeks and months, I think that I would agree to the step way of doing it, in that a certain level of benefits would be provided after the first term of service, or first period of service. I would recommend 3 years.

Most people, are in at least 3 years if they join, in some instances 4 years and in some instances, perhaps, 6 years. I would recommend 3 years because that is about 1 year, or at least it is a slight period before he is due to make a decision as to whether to get out, or stay in. If the person starts accruing these benefits at that period, then he would have that to think about during the period that he would actually be seriously considering staying in or getting out.

I would recommend starting at the 7-year level in assigning the second stage of benefits. I agree with the transferability clause. I am single at this time, but I think if I were married, I would place that high on the list. And I could see that even though I am not married, I still place it high on the list.

I would probably recommend assigning the transferability rights, either partially or fully, at the 9-year point, slightly before the midpoint of the career.

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you, that is very helpful.

Captain Facenda?

Captain **Facenda**. Yes, sir.

Good morning, Mr. Chairman. My name is Joe Facenda, of Portsmouth, Va., across the river. I am assigned to Attachment 1, 1402d Military Air Squadron at Langley Air Force Base.

My Air Force specialty code is K-1045-Q, which means I am a CT-39 instructor pilot. As such I fly the T-39 in support of Government travel, mainly the continental United States and Canada.

I graduated from the U.S. Air Force Academy in 1975, and after selection by the Academy board, and the masters cooperative program, which is no longer out there, I attended the University of Pittsburgh to get my masters in economics. Then I went to flight training and after flight training I went to fly the C-141's at Maguire Air Force Base, N.J., and now I am Langley flying a T-39. I am also using my GI bill off-duty to get my masters in business.

I am age 27, married, and have two children, a 3-year old daughter and a 1-year old son. As far as comments, most of my comments generally go along the same lines, just reinforcing or adding another vote to the tally. Specifically though, I think there is a problem with the GI bill and any kind of GI bill because I think the difference between officers and enlisted do give you some problems. The officer has a 4-year education already, 9 times out of 10, at least.

So, a 4-year education is not really applicable—we are mainly looking for a graduate degree. So, the transferability, I think, is a real incentive, most of us have already come in from ROTC or maybe the academies, or whatever. The transferability at the 6-, 7-, or 8-year point, somewhere in there, could go a long way toward convincing me to stay, even if it is just to get that extra benefit. I will at least have given Uncle Sam maybe 2 or 3 years more service, if he thinks it is worth it. I believe with the amount of money he has put into me, he would feel that way after flight school, college education, et cetera.

Back to the 1989 cutoff, I think whatever bill comes up, I strongly feel it ought to include everybody—and maybe it does, but it certainly ought to be retroactive, I feel to everybody who is in here because it goes back to some of these other problems of being limited to certain critical career fields.

The military especially is a team operation, no matter where you are. Don't start putting things out there that cause animosity among the ranks. He may be your best buddy, but the fact that he is getting paid a little bit more or has some extra benefits, when push comes to shove, and I think the guy is going to resent that, if all other things start getting really uncomfortable out there on the line. It is an extra irritant that could cause problems.

A couple of comments were made here about the first term maybe being closer to 3 years. I like that idea, because there are a lot of enlisted troops around, potentially that could make very fine officers. Well, if you don't give them that option to get out at 3 years to go back to school and get that degree and come back into the officer corps, then you have cut that avenue off more if you make them go 6 or 8 years before you allow them to do that.

The other thing is we are not as able to pay for a college education for our children when we have to move around every 2 or 3 years and keep getting a house payment of maybe $400, $500, $600, or even going up to $1,000 a month, and more—I know people who have them—whereas a lot of my peers—especially the older ones—are sitting there with their $150, $200 house payment for the rest of their lives. It is an extra benefit that could help offset some of the problems of being in the military service.

I have a cousin, for instance, who works for 3M, and his company is paying for his MBA. I don't see why Uncle Sam can't do the same thing to stay competitive. Certainly, with an All-Volunteer Force, I think that is the idea, to stay competitive, than the pirating idea wouldn't work at all, either. It is like an employment agency fee, almost, and I don't see it.

Mr. **Edgar**. Well, I think that the testimony this morning has been helpful to particularly Mrs. Heckler and her concerns about the pirating of military personnel. I think she will go and draft some legislation in a slightly different direction. She is really interested in that area.

I understand where her concern is coming from, I think three of you are pilots, and you know the big cry in Washington is that Uncle Sam puts a lot of money into training you to be good pilots and you land an awful lot of commercial airlines on a day-to-day basis, because of the training that you are given.

The question is how do you retain pilots. Mechanics are equally as important, and critical skills of computer operators. One of you is very interested in data processing and IBM and 3M Corp., and other large multinational corporations would love to have the skills that you have been given and trained for within the military.

The point is, what kinds of things can we do to make the All-Volunteer Army attractive, how can we encourage the brightest and best to come forward and join. Once we have given them basic training in a critical skill, even in some noncritical skills that are essential, how do we retain those persons within the system, and how do we then upgrade the image of the All-Volunteer Force, so that people will not leave the All-Volunteer Force in droves and find other occupations.

I mean, that is part of the goal and it is being put together in pieces. In the Nunn-Warner amendment last year that increased pay was part of the effort and some of the pay incentives that were put in place to retain people are part of the effort as well.

We are now looking at the educational area as to whether or not we can devise a bill that provides that same incentive.

The previous panel, I think, was a little bit tough in terms of proposing when the benefits levels should kicking. I appreciate your comment that the benefit you received from your basic service has given you a great advantage in moving to the Air Force.

Lieutenant **Hancock**. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. **Edgar**. In light of what all of you have heard from each other, in drafting a bill and putting together this education incentive, is there anything that has not been discussed go far that really bugs you about the All-Volunteer Service?

Captain **Facenda**. One assumption or something that seemed to me to be an implicit assumption, some of the earlier arguments about, perhaps, making the transferability after 20 years, may be to get the guy to extend beyond 20, to me is an implicit assumption that everybody can stay 30 years.

This idea of 30 years being the magic number, I have problems with it anyway, at age 52, in my case, I don't consider myself anywhere near ready for retirement, or for an enlisted troop it may be as early—with 30 years, he may be only 48.

But it is very possible that I can't stay 30 years, if I only make, say, colonel—if you don't make general, or something, you are going to be forced out earlier as an officer. Now, the enlisted I can't speak of, but that was an implicit assumption that came up earlier that kind of bothered me, that you are saying that everybody can stay 30 years, just because he wants to.

Mr. **Edgar**. That is a good point. Other comments?

Major **Evans**. Well, sir, the way I see it—there are two factors that bear directly on the retention problem in the All-Volunteer Service. One being the sense of frustration that we noted in the last several years—or trend since the Vietnam era, of doing more and more with less and less. That permeates all the way down to the grassroots level.

Hopefully, we are turning that around, we have already alluded to that effort. The other is if not the factual erosion of benefits, rather a perception of erosion of benefits, the GI bill termination in 1989 and the fact that nobody is elgible after 1976 was just one of those.

We are paying our people a little bit more, and in fact we were doing that in the early 1970's, trying to make them comparable to the civilians, or the civilian side of the house. Then we started taking away some of the other benefits, so a lot of people in the service perceived that as holding their own, at the very best. Actually their future benefits eroded.

We referred to retirement over and over here today, and that is certainly a drawing point, giving yourself a goal at the end of 20 years for 50 percent, or at the end of 30 years with the present retirement system. The compensation question, of course, education and the GI bill, and what we are trying to do here with H.R. 1400, I think would go a long way toward that perception of the erosion of benefits which we in the military feel exists.

Captain **Facenda**. Sir, if I could add one thing I meant to add about this transferability thing. We talked about a 10-year cutoff or something. I didn't quite understand how that gets implemented.

Mr. **Edgar**. The basic award would be after the eighth year. You could then transfer your benefits to your wife or children. You could do that as long as you were on active duty, and for 10 years after you leave active duty you could provide the transferability benefit.

Captain **Facenda**. Where that gives me problems is that you are going to give the guy the benefit, but if he does get out at 10 or only gives you 10 or 12 years, his children, in fact, are not going to be of age to use it. Ten years is not a very long period of time. But if you are going to let the guy have it at 8 years, but he may get out at 10 for whatever reason——

Mr. **Edgar**. Then he could use it for 10 more years.

Captain **Facenda**. But his kids may only be 6 or 7 years old when he gets out, so they may not be out of high school by the time it expires. I throw that up for consideration.

I would also like to——

Mr. **Edgar**. Hopefully, he would have had a job that puts him back to a competitive feature with other people, but that is a point.

Captain **Facenda**. OK, I hadn't thought of it in those terms, but I realize that now.

The honorable discharge thing, the discretionary power, obviously, is probably unworkable. I do feel very strongly that there ought to be an honorable discharge feature in it.

The article I read about H.R. 1400 said that one of the proposals to go with it said they were going to put that in there, but, in fact, I got the impression H.R. 1400 did not include it.

Mr. **Edgar**. H.R. 1400 does include an honorable discharge before benefits will accrue at any level.

Captain **Facenda**. I ran into some problems dealing with some of the younger troops—these guys getting out—they come in here and they are problem people for maybe 6 months to a year—all they want is to get out. They are just not compatible with the military, and they get out with a general discharge. If they were to get the GI bill——

Mr. **Edgar**. Persons with general discharges would not accrue any benefits under this system.

Captain **Facenda**. As far as the rate goes, or this idea of going to Harvard, I don't personally feel it is necessary. I think the basic entitlement should be perhaps some average or the high end of whichever State charges the highest for their own residents fees would be my idea of a fair price.

Mr. **Edgar**. I happen to think Lycoming College in Williamsport is probably a little better than Harvard, that's only because I graduated from there. [Laughter.]

Gwen?

Ms. PERRY. I don't have any questions. I think they pretty well covered the points.

Mr. EDGAR. We really appreciate you taking the time to share your views and your ideas. As you can sense from listening to the three previous panels, plus yourself, you have to take a composite of all of these comments in order to draft a bill that fits all of the services and meets all of the criteria.

We are going to go talk with the Army, as well to try and pick up on their recruitment and retention problems.

It has been interesting that all of the officers and enlisted people that we have talked to have been in favor of an education incentive. With varying degrees of how much impact it will have, varying degrees of what level it should be kicked in, all of them have supported it.

There is some concern by the administration about waiting for some test education programs to finish before we put this bill in place. It is my hope that we can move this bill by the end of April, or the first of May, get some help in the Senate and put it on the President's desk this year, so that it will be clear to everybody within the All-Volunteer Army now as to what benefits are available, what kind of recruitment and retention benefits are in place. I think with the VEAP program and some of the other test programs, it is very unclear what is available and there is this gap of people who are now pressured to leave the service by the 1989 date that we have to resolve in someway or another.

It is going to be difficult to make all of those deadlines and to secure the President's signature, but we are going to attempt to do it. Your testimony today will help in that effort.

Thank you.

Our second panel is also from the Air Force. Thank you for your patience today in listening to the other panelists. You have heard the comments—we are going over a little bit of common ground and many have made their points.

We will start at the other end of the table with Sergeant Stokes, and we will go in the other direction just to be different to break the monotony.

Give us a little bit of who you are, and what you are about. If you want to make comments on any of the issues we have raised, please feel free to do so.

Mr. Stokes.

STATEMENTS OF A PANEL CONSISTING OF SGT. LARRY STOKES, SERGEANT WEIBEL, AIRMAN TAYLOR, AIRMAN GRAHAM, SGT. GARY PERDEW, AND SGT. STAN ALDRICH, ALL OF THE U.S. AIR FORCE

Sergeant STOKES. Mr. Edgar, and distinguished members, I am glad to be here, and I do think that the educational benefits system that the military offers to the everyday serviceman is of vital importance to the quality of people that we want to keep in the service.

My name is Larry Stokes, I am a staff sergeant, I am currently assigned to Langley Air Force Base. I have been in since 1972. I came in under the old GI bill benefits with the Vietnam era, and they were quite essential to me in deciding to come into the service.

First of all, I am a little bit prejudiced toward the Air Force because I think it is the finest branch. However, I do feel that the educational benefits that we are offered, regardless of what branch I happen to be in, were a vital determining factor in my deciding to come into the service.

I think it would be a vital factor to any type of All-Volunteer Service, as far as you keeping quality people, getting people, getting them to enter the service, and to stay an adequate amount of time for us to have an effective deterrent to help us keep the peace, which is essentially the job of the military.

I feel this is the most essential point I could hope to make. I have been at Langley—my AFC there is 651-XL, I am a base procurement contract specialist. I will try to give you a little bit of vital statistics on myself by alluding to several things that came up earlier, but I will have to defer to that.

You asked for some of the things that bug some people in the military. Some of the deterring factors that you might consequently face in a job such as mine is that you deal with civilian counterparts that work for many of the major corporations and firms all over. These people are essentially performing the same tasks that you are for the Government, for Uncle Sam. And in performing my job I would like to think that my professionalism, my quality, my care that I put into the job is just as vital, if not more so, than the civilian counterpart that I am faced with. After all, I came from that same civilian community before I became a military member, so I feel like I have the intelligence to put that kind of care and concern into my job.

In facing the security and the financial aspects of life, you at the same time come into the point of view with the military man versus the civilian counterpart getting more than him and it is quite an enticement.

I think these are some of the things that are pulling our people away, call it pirating or whatever, it is an essential fact of life. We come from a competitive society which aims for the best and, hopefully, that is what the military will provide in the long run for its people.

I am married, I have one son who is 3-years old. And I am a recent graduate from State Middle College in Florida. I have my bachelors degree in business administration for human resources. I also have two associates. I think that the educational system provided by the military is a vital concern and an assistance to us.

Mr. EDGAR. Thank you very much. That is very helpful.

Sergeant Weibel.

Sergeant WEIBEL. Mr. Chairman, I am Sergeant Weibel. I am assigned to the 1st Component Repair Squadron at Langley Air Force Base, Va. My Air Force specialty code is a 34174, which is digital flight simulator technician. I work on computers that help to train the pilots to fly, we maintain data bases which we use to duplicate tactical scenarios, as well as instrument flight training and navigation.

I have been in the Air Force since 1973, I have been stationed at Castle Air Force Base, Calif., working on a B-52 flight simulator; at

Carswell Air Force Base in Texas on the 135 flight simulator, and on an Air Force Base in Germany on the F-4-E flight simulator.

I had 1 year of college before I came in the service. I am 28 years old and married. I have been married for 7 years, and we have no children.

I feel that the transferability of educational services by the military would be of great importance to myself and my family. I'm at a loss for words right now.

Mr. **Edgar**. OK, we will get back to you.

Airman Taylor.

Airman **Taylor**. Good afternoon. I am very proud to be here. I am Senior Airman Taylor, I am assigned to the 1st Equipment Maintenance Squadron at Langley. My Air Force specialty code is 43151, which means I am an aircraft jet mechanic. I work in phase inspection, and what we do there is, after the plane, the F-15 has flown 100 hours, we bring it in to the hangar and do a major inspection and fix any discrepancies we find.

I have been stationed at Langley for 3½ years. I plan on reenlisting in July and, hopefully, we are going to be going to Eglin Air Force Base in Florida in November.

I am a high school graduate, I have taken a couple of college classes, but I find it is very hard to run a household, work full time and go to school at the same time. My husband is also in the Air Force, he came in the same time as me. We don't have any children yet.

I don't like to differ with everybody but I don't like the idea of the transferability simply because, for one thing, it's not so bad to transfer it to the spouse possibly, but when the children become of age to go to college, they are also of age to go into the Air Force. In the service they could, presumably, get their own benefits. You are talking about a vast amount of money here. I think it could be spent elsewhere in the service, and serve the people who are in.

That was my major thing I wanted to say.

Mr. **Edgar**. Very good, thank you.

Airman Graham.

Airman **Graham**. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members. My name is James Graham, Jr., I am assigned to Langley Air Force Base with the 1913th Communications Group. My Air Force Specialty Code is a 304-X1, one of the critical career fields right now. My job is navigational aides repairman, which is navigational equipment used by pilots for getting to and from bases, and landing.

I have about 2½ years of college right now, mostly obtaining during civilian life. I am 30 years old, married and we have three children, age 1, 5, and 6 years old.

I kind of agree with the two-tier program because it would give the first termers an opportunity to get into the military, and if they desired to get out, they would have had a chance to accumulate some kind of benefits for getting an education.

As far as the transferability, I kind of agree with the 8- to 10-year criterion because by that time a guy is on his second term and he will have accumulated some benefits and if he chooses to use them at this time, he could use them. It also leaves him the option of transferring them to his dependents, his spouse.

As far as the 10-year expiration date, as far as the dependents are concerned where you may be talking about younger kids involved as in my case, it was mentioned, or I read somewhere, that 10 years after the dependent reaches the 18th birthday. I kind of agree with that because that doesn't take away the option to transfer to a dependent who is young at this time.

And I kind of like the idea that the benefits start occurring after 1 year of active duty.

Mr. **Edgar**. Very good. Any other comments?

Airman **Graham**. No, sir.

Mr. **Edgar**. Very good.

Sergeant Perdew.

Sergeant **Perdew**. My name is Gary Perdew. I have to apologize for the voice, I hope it doesn't hurt you as bad as it hurts me. I am a technical sergeant in the U.S. Air Force, serving at Langley Air Force Base in the 1st Civil Engineering Squadron. I am a 55570, which is in Air Force terminology a triple nickle, but it is actually a programs war control technician.

At present I am the mobility NCO of the squadron. I have been stationed at Langley for 7 years, so I have a vested interest in the area. I will pick up my BA degree in May of this year with St. Leo's College, 2½ years of that was through the GI bill. The GI bill was a strong incentive for me to come into the service, after fending for myself out there for 1½ years, I looked at the possibilities of going into the service and acquiring an education.

It has taken me 10 years to do so, but it definitely was an incentive, and I am glad that I had that available to me at that time.

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you very much.

Sergeant Aldrich.

Sergeant **Aldrich**. Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

I am T. Sgt. Stan Aldrich, I am assigned to Langley Air Force Base. I am an aircraft maintenance technician. I have been assigned at Randolph Air Force Base, Tex.; Tan Son Nhut Air Force Base, Vietnam; Ramstein Air Force Base, Germany; Bitberg Air Force Base, Germany; Hallman Air Force Base, N. Mex., and presently at Langley.

I came into the service in 1969, I was getting ready to be drafted into the Army, and I chose to come into the Air Force and fix airplanes instead of fighting in foxholes.

I can't say the GI bill is a big incentive to me, however, I just completed my BA degree in business, economics and marketing using the GI bill. I only used about 12 months of the entitlement, but I thought it was a big incentive there.

I am married to another Air Force member, who is also a sergeant in the Air Force. I have two children and I am really comfortable at Langley.

I really feel that the Vietnam era bill is probably the best because it was flexible, but yet simple. There were not a lot of programs thrown in where you could get caught up—we have talked about the two-tier systems, three-tier systems, 10-year extensions.

I think that a basic bill, the idea of the bill is what drags people to stay in on it. You don't sometimes make your options, or take your options early in your Air Force career. I didn't know what I was going to do when I came in the Air Force. I had been in college for 2 years as a music major, now I am a mechanic. So, things change.

Mr. **Edgar**. Fine tuning.

Sergeant **Aldrich**. Fine tuning, that's right.

I think now with the troops that work for me—I have about 16 troops that work for me—I talked to them Friday after I heard about the hearing, and most of the things that they come up with right now are dealing with quality of life. That is really what my problems are, I can't train people to fix aircraft when they are tied up with bad checks, housing problems, money problems in general.

I need to give them some incentives to get their education goals met, to show me that they can be trained and stay with the Air Force. I really get frustrated sometimes when we put a lot of effort in the training of troops, knowing that they are going to go out and they can pump gas and make more money than I am paying them now.

Some of the outside jobs that they have been offered are phenomenal. I just can't see trying to push them with just the GI bill. We need a round package, and that's the only comment I have.

Mr. **Edgar**. I appreciate your comment. Our attempt is to have this as part of the package. The old GI bill, at the request of former President Ford, agreed to by the Congress of the United States, terminated those benefits in December 1976. Those who have come in since then have not had the same kind of ongoing incentives.

So, our attempt is that this would be part—clearly it is not the whole package. It doesn't improve the entire quality of life within the service. But your point about the simplicity is really an important point for us to hear, because it was made at least once or twice in Washington at our hearings, that even if a bill is technically good, but very complicated, it doesn't become a very helpful tool to a recruiter, or to an officer who is trying to tell those who work for him what a benefit it is, unless he can explain it in a very clear and open fashion.

So, your point about simplicity is important, your point about quality of life is important, but I want you to understand, this is only a piece of that giant puzzle that we are attempting to make.

As I indicated earlier, I think it is a recognition that a midcourse correction is necessary in the All-Volunteer Forces, if we are going to make it work. I think the pay incentives last year were part of that midcourse correction, only a small part, but a part. This is part of that midcourse correction.

We went from a draft military to an All-Volunteer military without much knowledge of what kind of impact it was going to be, and this is just an additional part of that package.

Mr. Perdew, your sore voice worked very well, it didn't hurt me as much as I am sure it hurt you. You pointed out the incentive that the GI bill was for you entering the service.

Sergeant **Perdew**. Yes, sir.

Mr. **Edgar**. Do you think that this kind of an education bill, if put in place and guaranteed for at least the next 10 years or so, as a recruitment tool would act in that same way as an incentive?

Sergeant **Perdew**. I believe it will for certain individuals, sir. Everyone has priorities whether it is on education, family life, economic means or whatever. What Stan was talking about in the quality of life is the focus of the panel. An educational package is not going to satisfy everyone, not everyone puts as high priority on education as the other person. It is an outreach for those who do, though.

And as long as you can carry it and he views it as a benefit that he will not relinquish because he doesn't chose to pursue a degree, meaning that he can transfer it to his dependents, I think he will look at that as a true benefit, not on a use or lose note.

Mr. **Edgar**. Airman Taylor, I was particularly interested in your comment, being the only spokesman so far against the transferability clause.

Let me ask you a silly question first, do you ever think they ought to call you Airperson, rather than Airman, or are you happy with Airman?

Airman **Taylor**. I am happy with Airman.

Mr. **Edgar**. Are you? OK.

Let me call you Airperson just for today. [Laughter.]

Airman **Taylor**. OK.

Mr. **Edgar**. The issue of transferability, you make a very powerful point in terms of will it be a disincentive for young people or children of military personnel to enter the service if they are able to get a benefit.

Let's say you have four children, or three children, plus a wife and have got to take that whole little chunk of money and divide it five ways, or four ways, or three ways, or whatever you have in terms of total benefits. My guess is that while it could be for some who have small families, or a wife who uses the benefits, a fairly nice benefit, if you have a couple of children and a wife who all want to use the benefit, that benefit could be consumed fairly quickly.

I just wanted to make sure you were aware that it was not going to be $550 per month, per child, per spouse, and kind of lock in everybody after a period of time of having that benefit.

If we had unlimited resources at the Federal level that might make sense, but that is not exactly how it would work.

Airman **Taylor**. Right, I understand that. I would just like to say it is probably selfish, but I would rather see the money spent on people who are in the service because I know it is a vast amount of money, it must be, that transferability.

Mr. **Edgar**. There have been a lot of people concerned about the cost of this bill, and whether or not we can afford it. We presently have student loan programs costing some $4.2 billion with loans that are given to people who don't have to make any service commitment. As that gets modified under the new administration, and this new GI bill comes into effect, we think that it will be a very attractive incentive to go into the service and utilize those benefits.

One person mentioned in our hearings a different form of transferability. He proposed a transferability provision that would be a loan, rather than a grant. After the eighth year, an individual could draw down on the benefits and transfer those benefits as a loan to his wife or children. Then as he served additional years, that loan would be repaid.

Airman TAYLOR. That might take a little thinking, but that sounds interesting to consider it, at least.

Mr. EDGAR. The reason for designing it that way was to make it more of a retention tool. It would be a benefit that you would accrue for yourself, but if you wanted to transfer it, it would be a benefit that you could borrow on for your family. If you stayed long enough, you would eventually pay it off. If you stayed 4 more years you would pay off that benefit.

Airman TAYLOR. It seems like that would be good for retention.

Airman GRAHAM. Is that for 8 years, or would that start earlier than that?

Mr. EDGAR. No, it would start at the eighth year.

Gwen Perry?

Ms. PERRY. Thank you.

I would just like to make a couple of comments, over the statements in general this morning. I certainly appreciate Sergeant Aldrich's statement that we need to do a total package. I think, speaking now from the side my boss sits on, the Armed Services Committee, that we are looking at total packages. The message that was sent out to our men and women in uniform last year by the initiatives taken in the 96th Congress, the Nunn-Warner, the paid benefits, that sort of thing, were the beginnings, the first steps toward addressing all of the many, many ills that have led us to the position that we are in with manpower today.

The fact that this committee is holding a hearing here in Norfolk, they have taken time to travel down is very important. And it is that committee working with some of the initiatives coming out of the Armed Services Committee, that we hope will address the manpower problems that we are seeing.

It is also very important that we have the statements such as Airman Taylor made because as we look at paying for and trying to retain an All-Volunteer Force, it is going to mean a high cost, a high cost to the Department of Defense, if we are going to pay it, we need to channel that in the best possible direction. It is very important, not only in the personnel issues, but as we get into tie various weapon systems we have to buy.

We need to make sure that what we buy is something that is going to be and give us the most use. And I appreciate Airman Taylor's comments.

Thank you.

Mr. EDGAR. Do you have enough spare parts to maintain the goal?

The PANEL. No.

Mr. EDGAR. I just wanted to get that on the record.

Does anybody have any additional comments, or questions that they would like to raise before we dismiss this panel?

Sergeant STOKES. Yes, Mr. Edgar. I have one additional comment. A little bit earlier on when you were talking with some of the Navy personnel there was mention of distinguishing between the critical job AFSC's for benefits against the overall entitlements.

I was going to say in order to get the best people in position throughout the overall services, I don't think the distinguishing factors should be made because while you might have some jobs during a particular tenure that might be assigned as critical, those jobs, once brought up to manning might be dropped off. Then when they hit that status again, if they have been reassigned critical, you could have individuals within the same career field where one has the benefits and the other doesn't.

So, I think it should be made across the board, it would be more effective—a more effective management tool.

Mr. **EDGAR**. Some would question whether Members of Congress are critical. [Laughter.]

Thank you for your comment, and thank you for your time.

We will move to our final panel at this point before adjourning for our afternoon session, Robert Harris, James Franey, Earnestine Gilbert, Deborah Bates, and Robroy Ockerman.

We have just discovered that Mr. Facenda's great uncle, is a former Philadelphia businessman who I know very well. He happened to get a doctorate degree from Lycoming College in Williamsport, the year I graduated. So, it is a small world. It is good to find out those bits and pieces of information.

Thank you for being so patient this morning. It is always tough to sit and listen to other people share ideas, some of which, I'm sure you have had and wanted to share as well.

We started today's panel with some of the newer enlistees within the Navy and my guess is that some of you are also newer enlistees in the Air Force. We appreciate your comments that you will make.

Let's go down the line, starting with Sergeant Harris.

STATEMENTS OF A PANEL CONSISTING OF M. SGT. ROBERT L. HARRIS, AIRMAN DEBORAH A. BATES, AIRMAN EARNESTINE GILBERT, SGT. JAMES FRANEY, AND SGT. ROBROY OCKERMAN, ALL OF THE U.S. AIR FORCE

Sergeant **HARRIS**. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I would like to say I feel honored to have this opportunity to be here. My name is M. Sgt. Robert L. Harris, I am assigned to the 1st Combat Support Group, at Langley. I have been in the Air Force for 18 years. My Air Force specialty code is 73274, it means that I am the base career adviser for enlisted retention.

I am an in-service recruiter. I work with commanders, senior enlisted advisers, any career advisers, all base activities, supervising and counseling and career planning; and developing local information geared at the retention program.

I entered the Air Force upon graduation from high school in 1962. I completed my basic training and technical training at Lackland Air Force Base. Initially, I was assigned to security police career field.

I retrained in 1966 to the personnel career field. I was then at Pease Air Force Base, N.H. After completion of my tour at Pease Air Force Base, N.H., I spent a year in Thailand and I went to Mildenhall, England for 4 years, went to Maxwell Air Force Base, which is my prime assignment. I stayed there for 7 years.

I was assigned to Langley in July 1979, and I took over my present job in May of 1980. I have 38 semester hours of college toward an associate degree in resource management. And I am currently enrolled in the Saint Leo College. I am 37 years old, married, my wife, Rebecca and I have three children, two boys and a girl, Bobby is 15, Kevin, 13 and Tanya, 10.

The only issues that we talked about here so far, I have talked to a lot of the young first-termers, career and everybody on the base, including commanders and so forth about. I think we need to have a continuous graduation of benefits.

In other words, maybe starting at the 2-year point, initially, since the Army has 2-year enlistees, in some areas. Then I say about the 6-year point we need to have another one, halfway down the road, at the 10-year point, we need another one. And at the 20-year point we need one.

The significance—I don't think anybody really touched on this, at the 20-year point. In the Air Force we have—and I imagine in any branch of the service you have them—you have some guys that we call fast burners, they make chief in 16 years or 18 years of service; they need some type of incentive to keep them on board to 30. I really feel that we need to have a program for them.

I know, myself, that would be an additional incentive to me to stay.

I have some heartburn, I know everybody expressed that already, but we don't need it for critical skills. We need it across the board. We have bonuses to fix the critical skill problem, but we need incentives to keep everybody above board.

I feel that everybody is needed that we have on board. Some skills, yes, they are more competitive in civilian life and so forth, and they can demand the better income out there. But they are still needed.

The transferability clause I think that is a good clause. I think it should be there. I have some feelings on the fact that possibly something should be added to the fact that if you do transfer these benefits and the kids decide that they want to use this benefit, there should be some clause that they have to give some other military service because of using the transferability.

I feel that each young man needs to spend at least 2 years in the military, if no more than to teach him discipline and how to come to work on time, and things of that nature. I think every American needs that. I feel that a lot of the young kids that go straight through college and get out in the civilian world. I don't feel that they are really ready to go out in the civilian world. I believe that any type of military service, no matter what branch, prepares you for that.

Thank you.

Mr. EDGAR. Do women need that discipline, as well?

Sergeant HARRIS. I think so, sir.

Mr. EDGAR. Airman Bates.

Airman BATES. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Airman Deborah A. Bates, I was born and raised in Connecticut. I joined the military in July of 1978, and I have been stationed at Langley for a little over 2 years. I get out in July of 1982, and I think the GI bill, if it does come out, will change a lot of things around, if I stay in or get out.

That's pretty much all I have to say.

Mr. **Edgar**. What you are basically saying is if a GI bill were to be put in place, and you would accrue benefits by it, you would make some decision in 1982, whether to stay in and gain more benefits, or go out at that point.

You fell into that period of time after 1976 when you joined, where you are not covered by the Vietnam era GI bill?

Airman Bates. Right.

Mr. **Edgar**. That's helpful.

Airperson Gilbert.

Airman **Gilbert**. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am Senior Airman Earnestine Gilbert. I am a member of the 1 Combat Support Group at Langley Air Force Base. My specialty code is 73250, that means I am a personnel specialist. We handle all the paperwork and CBPO for ID cards, any little thing—reenlistments, outbound assignments, incoming assignments, stuff like that.

I have been in the service only 2 years. My husband was in the service as a staff sergeant, so I decided to join up. So, I didn't have any incentive of the GI bill; but I could use it.

I have two kids, one 5 and one 3. I have been here since July of last year. Before I came here I was at Dover Air Force Base, in Delaware.

Mr. **Edgar**. Very good, thank you.

Sergeant Franey.

Sergeant **Franey**. I am Sgt. James Franey, I am currently assigned to the 1st Security Police Squadron at Langley. My Air Force specialty code is 81152, which means that I am a security policeman. I am currently in my senior year of college. I have previously been stationed at Lackland Air Force Base, for basic training, and 3 years at Shephard Air Force Base, Tex.

I am married, have one child, 11 months old. About the only thing I could add is maybe somebody would want to help the person that comes in. I came in just before the 1976 cutoff, and I am using my GI bill quite extensively. I just reenlisted about 1½ years, so that I can finish my degree.

If I were to have had to wait until I got out to receive any of these benefits for my education, I probably would have gotten out already.

Mr. **Edgar**. That's very helpful.

Sergeant?

Sergeant **Ockerman**. My name is Sergeant Ockerman, I am assigned to the 1st Maintenance Squadron at Langley Air Force Base. My Air Force specialty code is 42355, that means I am an aerospace ground equipment mechanic.

I received my training at Chanute Air Force Base, Ill. I am a high school graduate, I am 22, married, and have two kids and another one due in July. I told my wife the other day that maybe she might be able to go to school after the kids get to school, and she was tickled pink by that.

Mr. **Edgar**. That is helpful.

Sergeant **Ockerman**. If she is happy, then I am happy and I might stay in the Air Force some more.

Mr. **Edgar**. I thank all of you for your statements.

Airman Gilbert, were you aware of the VEAP program, the veterans education adjustment program, when you came in, the ability to take some of your salary and put it into a fund, were you aware of that program?

Airman GILBERT. Yes, I was.

Mr. EDGAR. Did it have any incentive for you at all?

Airman GILBERT. No. I once thought about maybe putting, I think it was $25 and they said, no, you have to put at least, I think it is $50 or $75. So, no, that is too much money, I would have to lose out of my base pay to get it back way after I get out of the service. I need something that I could use right now.

Mr. EDGAR. I don't like the program either, in terms of the testimony we received. It has not done the trick for recruitment or retention incentive, and it has been burdensome for some. But that is all we have at this point, until something new is put in its place.

Do any of you have any questions you would like to ask, or any additional information you would like to add, given all of the testimony today?

Sergeant HARRIS. Well, Mr. Chairman, I get a lot of questions in my job on when can we expect this type of legislation to take an effect. I don't really have a ball park figure to tell. I am trying to get the guys to hang on, through extensions and things of that nature, hoping for miracles to happen.

Young people today are intelligent and they want to tie you down to a specific time, they don't want to say 2 years from now, 3 years from now, whatever.

Mr. EDGAR. Well, let me just say that we hope we can see a piece of legislation put on the President's desk this year. My timetable is the first part of May to hold markup. We will have had 6 hearings and heard from at least 100 different witnesses, including all of the testimony today and all of the testimony we have from our Boston hearings.

We have gone over and over this ground a great number of times. What we create will have to have a couple of factors put in. One factor is the new administration's interest in not having any up-front money, up-front costs to any piece of legislation this year. I think they would be willing 2 years, 3 years down the line to have that figure rise. We estimate our bill to cost about $600 million, of cost coming in the out years of 1983 and 1984. I think the new administration could buy that.

So, the one factor is cost and the other factor is that the administration has said they are interested in the GI bill, but we want to wait until all these test programs are done. I think what members of our committee are saying is that we are pretty sure we won't learn very much from the test programs, particularly because some of them have not been put in place as of yet, and some of them are inefficient in terms of the data they provide. We already have some data on the VEAP program and its workability.

You will be able to see some signposts along the way. Getting the bill out of our committee is probably the first step, if it makes it that far. Then I think there is at least some momentum. We have to get concurrence on the legislation from Mr. Whitehurst's committee, the Armed Services Committee, and then out on the House floor.

Then we have to go to the Senate, and make sure a similar bill passes the Senate, work out word-for-word agreement. Then that comes back for approval in the House and Senate, and we lay it on the President's desk.

My hope is that we can put something on his desk by September. I may be overly optimistic—there are some people in the room who represent the administration. I think if we draft a bill that meets the financial requirements, and is sharp enough in its commitment, that the President would sign the bill as part of his overall package of upgrading the All-Volunteer Force.

It is going to be an interesting year, but I would not spend the money yet.

Sergeant HARRIS. OK. Mr. Chairman, I have one more point, the Air Force just came out with a new program where they laid on the education-type program for three AFSC's. I feel that this is going to do nothing but cause more heartburn than serve as a retention incentive. I base this on my judgment of the step program that they just came up with for promotions, where they give 200 promotions throughout the Air Force and these guys are selected across the board, in other words some commander—it is a political type promotion.

I feel that you are going to have the same problems with an education program of that nature, the haves and the have-nots problem will mushroom into a big thing.

Mr. EDGAR. Well, we will try to avoid that by getting our bill out quickly, and probably terminating all those other benefit programs.

Any other comments that you would like to make?

Airman BATES. What will happen to the VEAP program if this bill does come out?

Mr. EDGAR. As I understand it, the VEAP program will be terminated, if this program is passed. There is some question as to the extension of the VEAP program anyway. This would replace the VEAP program. There would be no contributory provisions in this bill.

Airman BATES. So, all the money that was put into the VEAP would just be given back?

Mr. EDGAR. You can withdraw it, or continue in the VEAP program and use it. But my feeling is that we would probably try to phase out the VEAP program entirely.

Any other questions?

[No response.]

Mr. EDGAR. Everybody has been very kind and gracious to take the time today to participate in this hearing. We do have a discussion planned for a little later this afternoon with several other people, but I want to thank you for your contribution.

If we are successful in getting this bill through the House and Senate and on the President's desk, I hope you all will take a little bit of credit in saying that you had something to do with the movement of that piece of legislation.

The hearing will stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:45 p.m. the subcommittee adjourned.]

H.R. 1400—THE VETERANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1981

THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1981

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION,
TRAINING, AND EMPLOYMENT,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Boston, Mass.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9 a.m., at room 2003A, John F. Kennedy Federal Building, Government Center, Boston, Mass., Hon. Bob Edgar presiding.

Present: Representatives Heckler and Frank.

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN EDGAR

Mr. EDGAR. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. It is a pleasure to welcome you to the sixth and final hearing on H.R. 1400, the Veterans' Education Assistance Act of 1981.

Today's hearing of the House Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Education, Training, and Employment was preceded by four formal hearings in Washington last month. At that time, we received testimony from over 50 witnesses—representatives on the Department of Defense, the uniformed services, and the public and private sector—on the merits of a new GI bill.

However, apart from hearing the views of military experts and top Government officials, we decided that it was virtually impossible to understand the impact of this legislation until we had this opportunity to go out and listen to the people in the field.

So we took our hearings out into the field. We spent some time down in Norfolk, Va., on April 6 listening to the Navy and the Air Force and today, as everyone recognizes, we are listening to the Army and the Air Force.

H.R. 1400 was designed to assist the military in attracting and retaining quality personnel. An education incentive program has been proven effective over the years by application of previous GI bills from World War II to the Vietnam era.

During our hearings, we have been shown the statistics and the performance records of former GI bills. One particularly impressive example showed the huge influx of potential recruits swamping recruiters offices in December 1976, the last month of eligibility for the Vietnam era GI bill. Large numbers of men and women were joining the military at that time in order to take advantage of an educational entitlement in the future.

Since then, we have seen a deterioration in the number and the quality of recruits joining the service. We have also been told of large numbers of midlevel career NCO's and officers who are leaving the service and leaving a vacuum in leadership behind them.

We feel that H.R. 1400 can help reverse this trend. But we also realize that an education incentive package is only part of an overall benefit and salary improvement plan designed to assist the All-Volunteer Force and avoid an all-out return to the draft.

Next week, the Congress of the United States will reconvene to review and approve the budget proposal which could authorize billions of dollars for increased spending for military hardware. I personally feel it is vitally important that before we make the enormous commitment in equipment, we first set our priorities in favor of the individuals who will operate that equipment now and in the future.

Rather than just throwing money at our problems, we need to invest it wisely and carefully. In my opinion, an education program has been a very wise and a lucrative investment in our country in the past. It has placed our priorities on the individual, as a citizen, as a soldier, and as a veteran. I believe H.R. 1400 is designed to accomplish those goals once again.

Before we begin, I would like to yield to my colleague from Massachusetts, the ranking Republican on this committee, for her opening statement. And I want to say first that I particularly thank you for taking the time not only to share these hearings, but to go to Norfolk and to spend the many hours that you have spent in Washington on these important hearings.

STATEMENT OF HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mrs. Heckler. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you very personally for agreeing to have a hearing in Boston, and to have allowed New England to have a voice in the formulation of our new policy on a prospective GI bill.

I believe that the testimony today will make an important contribution to the consideration of H.R. 1400, and I also feel that it is significant that Massachusetts is again a part of the defense map of the United States. For some time we had to struggle to keep Fort Devens within our Commonwealth.

We are very proud of our military installations. We are very proud of our military personnel, and we are proud of the contribution that they are making to America. I have to say that we are also proud in Massachusetts of our veterans population.

Today we have over 1 million veterans in our general population, of which 250,000 are Vietnam era veterans. All of them make a contribution to our society, and I feel very privileged to serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee in Washington with you, on the committee that legislates programs to provide for the needs of our veterans across the board, the veterans of all wars.

I believe that the subcommittee, of course, has spent a great deal of time on the priority of the Vietnam era veterans. The educational benefits with which we have been most concerned and the other programs which have really been, I think, at the top of our agenda have related to that era, and to that group of veterans. And that priority concern does continue as a matter of public policy in Washington.

However, we find in consideration of H.R. 1400 a new and totally different agenda. This subcommittee is now examining the opportunity through a new educational assistance program to enhance recruitment prospects for the armed services and to repay experienced military personnel who form the backbone of the military, and who are leaving for civilian life in very alarming numbers.

Last year, for example, every branch of the military failed to meet its recruiting goals. The Army came out 17,800 short, the equivalent of 1 division. The Navy is short 22,000 experienced petty officers, or about 10 percent of the 200,000 such personnel who are needed.

This committee earlier, as you mentioned, the subcommittee, conducted a field hearing at Norfolk, Va., the headquarters of the Navy's Atlantic fleet. The Navy informed us there that the shortages were particularly acute in the radar, sonar and aviation areas. In other words, the readiness aspects of the Navy's 13 aircraft carriers.

We learned and spoke with personnel who were familiar with the problems of the U.S.S. *John F. Kennedy*, and the *Dwight D. Eisenhower*. Last year when the *Eisenhower* sailed to the Indian Ocean to replace the *Nimitz*, it was short 580 sailors, predominantly in supervisory jobs.

The carrier *Constellation* at that time was also operating short, in this case 530 personnel fewer than required. When the *Kennedy* sailed to the Mediterranean, it had to borrow 50 sailors from other ships to staff its own engine room.

Congress last year tried to respond to the needs of our military with an impressive pay raise, and will follow this year with a similar pay raise. But more is needed, expecially in the absence of an attractive educational assistance program. Today the service person's only opportunity for educational benefits after service is under a contributory program. For every dollar that the man or woman service person contributes, the Veterans' Administration will make a matching contribution of $2, once the person becomes a veteran and elects to attend school.

This program has been far less than successful. Only 320,000 service personnel have elected to pick up the pace. A third of those have already withdrawn. Service personnel cannot afford this program, which takes away a fifth of their income.

I happen to feel that it is a national disgrace that we have service families who are forced to use the food stamps program in order to meet their budgetary requirements. How can a service family, under those circumstances, allow to have a breadwinner or a woman in the service use part of a very essential fund on education?

The new GI bill legislation which this committee is considering has a very important effect, and hopefully will have a reciprocal effect on both the military and on the Veterans' Administration. The reciprocation will occur in the gaining of eligibility for educational benefits as one serves in the military.

The availability of benefits will also be predicated upon some service in the Reserve or the National Guard. In Massachusetts currently there is a program which provides for tuition assistance for a year for membership in the National Guard. And preliminary indications are that this is an attraction to service in the National Guard, and a position indication with regard to the legislation that we are considering. Massachusetts is leading the way for this legislation.

Making benefits available is likely to benefit not only our active military but our reserves. As we consider the significance of H.R. 1400, it is quite clear that we are dealing with the future of the All-Volunteer Force. If the All-Volunteer Force fails, there will be a return to the draft as the only means of providing the necessary qualified personnel to staff our military in adequate numbers.

I would prefer it to remain and to provide the incentives for the All-Volunteer Force. We must make it work and this is why, I think, the witnesses today, the eight panels from whom we will hear, must provide information and make contributions to the considerations of this subcommittee.

The fact is that their input, from the experienced point of view that they bring to the issue, can be vital in our drafting of this legislation.

We have heard from the top brass in Washington, and now we hope to hear from the troops in Massachusetts and those representing New England. We are looking forward to the breadth of testimony which we will receive, and I happen to feel that this is one of the most important issues before our Congress and before the Nation. The question of our defense relates not only to military procurement and hardware and weapons systems, but even more important to people power.

I am delighted that we will have women in our panels as well as men, and I am delighted that we have so many in the military today who will provide testimony which will help our deliberations.

So I thank you once again for coming to Massachusetts, Mr. Chairman. I know your visit will be worthwhile.

Mr. EDGAR. Thank you, Mr. Heckler.

I would like to call now our first panel of witnesses from the Army, Private Bogan, Corporal MacNeil, Sergeant Shaffer, Specialist Rutherford and Private Hicks.

I hope all of you will relax and feel comfortable in talking with us.

Let me just for everyone's background and information, share the major provisions of H.R. 1400.

The first provision is a preservice educational assistance program. It is limited to high school graduates and it provides the basic benefit of $300 per month, paid for over 36 months and no higher than that.

The second basic provision is what is called a basic educational assistance, and that is limited also to high school graduates, but it requires that someone serve for 3 years within the military, and after that 3 years they would be provided a maximum 36 months of benefits at $250 a month.

The third provision is a supplemental educational assistance provision, and that is that after an additional 3 years, or a total of 6 years, that basic monthly benefit would rise to $550.

The fourth provision that we are looking at is a transfer of entitlement to dependents, and we are trying to figure out a way in which, after a period of time, 8 or 10 years, we would provide a transfer payment to wives and children of military service personnel in order to retain them on the long term.

Now I hope as we go through the hearings today we won't get hung up on the dollar amounts, other than to talk about whether or not they are adequate. The bill that we have before us is a basic framework, it's a skeletal around which around the 7th of May we will be marking up in our subcommittee, and then taking to the full committee and hopefully to the full House and to the Senate.

So we are really at a very skeletal stage in the writing and drafting of the legislation. The dollar figures that are provided here are basically for discussion, and we see it basically as a two-tiered piece of legislation, one basic entitlement after 3 years of service; a second basic entitlement after 6 years of service, which is more substantial; and third the transferability provision to the three basic provisions.

So, again, welcome to the hearing today. Why don't we begin by, let's start with Sergeant Shaffer in the middle and move out to the sides.

STATEMENTS OF A PANEL CONSISTING OF PRIVATE BOGAN, CORPORAL MacNEIL, SERGEANT SHAFFER, SPECIALIST RUTHERFORD, AND PRIVATE HICKS, ALL OF THE U.S. ARMY

Sergeant **SHAFFER**. Sergeant Shaffer, demolitions sergeant, Charlie Company, 2d Battalion, 10th Special Forces Group, I have been in my job about 3 years, 8 months. I have been in the Army for 3 years, 8 months. I am 24, and I am not married.

Brief description of military service, I have been a sergeant since I came into the service. I have been in the same company for approximately 3 years, 8 months.

Mr. **EDGAR**. Let's get down and introduce everyone, then we will get back to asking you specific questions.

Corporal MacNeil?

Corporal **MACNEIL**. I am Corporal MacNeil. My job description is a squad leader and reenlistment NCO for A Company, 39th Combat Engineers. I have been in that position since July 1980. I am 28 years old, I am married and have one child. I live in Leominster, Mass. I have been a combat engineer ever since I came in, in April of 1979. I have worked my way up from private to squad leader.

Mr. **EDGAR**. Private Bogan?

Private **BOGAN**. My name is Private Bogan. I just recently finished my advanced individual training at Fort Devens for a security specialist. Before that, I took basic training at Fort Dix. I am 19 years old and I am single. From here, in a week, I go to Fort Benning, Ga., for jump school, to be a paratrooper.

Mr. **EDGAR**. Thank you.

Specialist Rutherford?

Specialist **RUTHERFORD**. My name is Specialist Rutherford. I am a medic. I have been in this field approximately 2 years and 3 months. I have been in the service 3 years come June 1. I have been stationed in Fort Gordon in Texas, and I spent a year in Korea at the demilitarized zone and I have been at Fort Devens now for 9 months. I am married and I have no kids.

Mr. **EDGAR**. Thank you.

Private Hicks?

Private HICKS. Good morning. My name is Private Claudette Hicks. I am 21 years old. I am single, and I have no dependents. I have been on active duty for almost 9 months. Presently, I am in advanced individual training at Fort Devens, 1st Batallion, Charlie Company. I am an MI, military intelligence, student. I am training to become an O5H, which is morse code interceptor, receiver and teletypist.

Mr. EDGAR. Very good.

Sergeant Shaffer, let me begin the questioning with you. Could you describe just briefly what brought you into the service, what were the reasons and conditions that you decided to join the All-Volunteer Force?

Sergeant SHAFFER. I have always wanted to be in the service. I just worked for awhile and decided, I was 21, time to come into the service.

Mr. EDGAR. Do you think that there would have been any extra incentive to you to come in if you knew that service with an All-Volunteer Force over a period of time would have accrued you some GI educational benefits?

Sergeant SHAFFER. No, I don't think that it would have made much difference.

Mr. EDGAR. So your decision was made on your own personal need?

Sergeant SHAFFER. Right.

Mr. EDGAR. Do you plan to make a career of the military?

Sergeant SHAFFER. Yes, I do.

Mr. EDGAR. And what particular field do you plan to pursue within the military?

Sergeant SHAFFER. The field I am in now, engineering.

Mr. EDGAR. What do you think about the provisions of this bill in terms of retention, the fact that we have within the bill of compotent that says if you stay long enough we will be able to provide you educational benefits if you leave, let's say, after 6 years, or we will be able to provide some transfer to your family. Do you have any feelings about that?

Sergeant SHAFFER. As far as staying in the service for 6 years and deciding to get out, I can see better places to spend the money, I think, to keep people in, instead of in 6 years then getting out. As far as better training, more money for training, things like that, I think it would be a lot better. It would be a better way to spend the money.

Mr. EDGAR. Than providing educational benefits?

Sergeant SHAFFER. That is my personal opinion.

Mr. EDGAR. Does anyone on the panel disagree with that statement?

How about you, Corporal MacNeil? How do you feel about education as an incentive for retention in recruitment?

Corporal MACNEIL. I feel that education is something that once you get it nobody can ever take it away from you. I personally feel that education is important. If a person only stays for 6 years and he can get out and still improve himself because he has been in for 6 years, I feel it's a good point in favor of the bill, in favor of H.R. 1400.

But then you are getting away from the retainability that the service needs so badly because you get people who get to the sergeant level, which is easily obtained most times in 6 years, and then you lose them and you have to start all over again with another person again.

Mr. **Edgar**. The argument was made by someone who helped develop the bill that we need a larger number of people to be recruited then to be retained over a long period of time. And they argued that if we could maintain people for 6 years, that that was an investment larger than the first enlistment, that that was an important thing to do so you wouldn't have to keep training people.

But then on beyond that for people who stay in a career mode in a military for life, that there would be fewer people. Therefore, the incentive could be altered perhaps in a transfer division for those who decided to stay but those who had spent 6 years would have earned a benefit that they could then, in a sense, cash out by educational benefits after they leave and again improve themselves.

Do you think that has any merit, from your perspective?

Corporal **MacNeil**. The retainability, I think, is one of the most important thing we have to work with. I think that the bill takes care of that in two places, because it encourages you to go to 6 and usually when someone is at the midcareer point, and 6 years would put you there, you are usually pretty well settled and you are most likely going to stay and go the whole route.

Mr. **Edgar**. Specialist Rutherford, you mentioned that you were married. One part of the transferability provision is to provide for ability for a wife or child to use the benefits after a period of time.

The time limit in the bill is 8 years, and some suggested that we perhaps should raise it to 10 years, or at least a larger commitment before the transferability kicks in. But let's just talk about the ability, after a period of time, when you have made your commitment to stay within the All-Volunteer Service, do you think that, given your limited experience with your wife, and what you see as your future, that that would be a helpful thing to encourage you to stay within the military?

Specialist **Rutherford**. Well, for myself it would be because as of now I can't say how long I intend to stay. It would be because I am trying to go to school and my wife would like to go back to school. With this benefit I would be able to afford to send her to school at the same time I go myself.

But as an incentive to keep all persons in, I can't really say because each person has his own reason for why he would stay. Education is a good reason, is an incentive but it's not a complete incentive. Retention itself is bad now. An education bill would help in retaining personnel who are qualified or who have been in their job a long time.

Mr. **Edgar**. One of the points I tried to make in my opening statement is that last year we passed something called the Nunn-Warner amendment, which increased the pay incentives to the All-Volunteer Army and some of us believe the education incentive would be part, not all but a part, of that package—pay incentives, reenlistment incentives and an education incentive—to kind of fine tune the All-Volunteer Army.

The mood in Washington is a strange mood. The President has indicated no interest in moving back to a draft. But there are a number of people within the House and the Senate who are looking at ways to meet the recruitment goals that are set and try to cut across the education and class levels of our society by returning to a draft. I happen to oppose that.

It seems to us that if we are going to make the All-Volunteer Army work, all-volunteer military work, we would have to fine tune what was put in place. What we did was, we changed from a selective service system to an All-Volunteer Force, but kept the mentality of the selective service draft system in place, and it wasn't until recently that we began to address the salary levels and the quality of life experience within the service.

Specialist **Rutherford**. Mr. Chairman, there was one thing I wanted to find out, or get clear. This new bill is only for persons who have a GED equivalent or high school credit, right?

Mr. **Edgar**. Right.

Specialist **Rutherford**. What about those in a combat situation who would not have high school education or GED? They will have served their country well in combat, and yet they will not be qualified for this educational benefit.

Mr. **Edgar**. What do you think about that? What kinds of feelings do you have about the equality of that?

Specialist **Rutherford**. I can understand the need for the high school education or the GED equivalent, unless you know exactly what level that person is on. But at the same time I think it's not fair to that person who served in the combat field, serving his country, that he cannot, maybe at a later date, or his children or wife, get those same benefits.

Mr. **Edgar**. That is a very good point. I was discussing this with staff yesterday, and it occurred to me that one possible option would be to change that to the point where the benefits would kick in as soon as that particular individual would complete his high school education. So that it would give that person an incentive to complete their GED or their equivalency of high school, and then their benefits would kick in, even if they served for 3 years and got out and in the fifth or sixth year they completed their high school equivalency, their benefits would in fact kick in for the period of time that their eligibility would stay constant.

I think that may be more equitable to do it that way. The incentive is to try to get people to the point of completing the high school level and trying to raise the level of recruit that you get into the military service.

Specialist **Rutherford**. I understand that.

Mr. **Edgar**. It's unfair, as you have pointed out, that if two people are fighting in a combat situation or trained in a similar situation, one has their high school diploma and one does not, that one accrues benefits and the other does not.

Let me ask the two privates on either end to describe just briefly what it was that encouraged you to come into the all-volunteer forces, and what have you found since you have gotten in?

Private Hicks. I have found various things since I have been in. I am studying corporate law and I came in to complete my education. I don't think I would have come in if it hadn't been for the education benefits that I am getting, and when I do start my family I would hope—I would like to be able to think that they would be able to get some kind of benefits for the time that I have done.

Mr. Edgar. The question about VEAP will come up quite a bit this morning, the veterans' educational assistance program that was put in place is a contributory program and you as a new person within the system, does it frustrate you that you have to make a contribution to that program while people who, for example, were covered under the Vietnam era GI bill do not have to make that same kind of contribution, the Federal Government, in fact, sets that aside as a benefit?

Private Hicks. No, because times change and I would see myself through school anyway.

Mr. Edgar. So you don't mind making the contribution?

Private Hicks. No.

Mr. Edgar. Do you think that the benefits of the VEAP program are sufficient?

Private Hicks. Yes, but then again, no, because of the way it is being utilized, and because of people not utilizing it.

Mr. Edgar. Private Bogan, I wonder if you might respond to that question about what got you into joining the All-Volunteer Force?

Private Bogan. Mr. Chairman, I came in right out of high school. All my uncles were military officers, either in the Army or the Air Force.

Mr. Edgar. So it was genetic?

Private Bogan. I felt really good, I guess I idolized them. But once I went down to the recruiter I talked to him about all kinds of different things I was going to get into, and I was going to go for infantry, airborne infantry, but I was kind of geared away from it when they saw my scores when I took the tests for the Army.

And they kind of geared me toward military intelligence. Once I found that, I found what I wanted to do and got into it. Now I am going to do extra training that I wanted to do. The money didn't really matter at the time.

Mr. Edgar. Thank you.

I am going to yield to my colleague from Massachusetts, but I want to say thank you to all of you on the first panel for being the first guinea pigs. It's always the toughest to come up first.

Mrs. Heckler. Thank you.

I want to say that I have enjoyed the comments of the panel so far. I have to say, Private Hicks, you are highly motivated obviously. Were you motivated by a recruiter to seek an opportunity in the field of intelligence in the Army?

Private Hicks. I have family members who were in the service in the M.I., but I did become more aware of the fact about the system from my recruiter.

Mrs. Heckler. What would you say is the level of morale in the military today as you have experienced it? Have you seen a change since there has been a new emphasis on the development of the defense of the country and a stronger support for defense? Have you seen a change in morale?

Private **Hicks**. I would have to say, yes, because of the attitude, and this is based on civilians and enlistees.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Would the others on the panel agree that there has been an improvement in morale, would you say that generally? [Everyone nods.]

Do you want to make another comment?

Private **Hicks**. I don't know if there has been an improvement, but I don't think it has gone down any.

Mrs. **Heckler**. The Wall Street Journal had reported an improvement. We are concerned about the two questions of the All-Volunteer Force, and that is the question of recruitment because we are not recruiting in sufficient numbers to fill every important slot that has to be maintained, and second the retention of qualified people.

Now in terms of recruitment and retention, the two generally held incentives that are considered most attractive are certainly compensation, first of all, and secondarily educational assistance.

At the moment the military has received one increase, pay increase in the last year, and another or possibly two increases legislated this year. Does the military presently expect the two-level increase? Do you happen to know if there is a great deal of talk at Fort Devens about increases in pay?

Private **Hicks**. Yes, I have seen some bulletin briefings on it. I think there is supposed to be an increase sometime around June, June, or July.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Is there an expectation of a two-scale increase?

Private **Hicks**. This I cannot say.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Would anybody else like to comment on that?

Specialist **Rutherford**. I think there is an expectation of a two-scale pay increase this year.

Mrs. **Heckler**. If that does not materialize, will that have a major effect on morale in the military, do you think?

Specialist **Rutherford**. Possibly, highly possible.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Would you say likely?

[No response.]

Mrs. **Heckler** [continuing]. Any other response? Private Bogan, were you going to say something?

Private **Bogan**. Mrs. Heckler, I was going to say the same thing. I was told there would be one in July and one in October. The one in July I was told was something like 5.6 percent, and the one in October was 10.3, I think.

Mrs. **Heckler**. It was 9.3.

Private **Bogan**. I just want to say one thing. I feel that the experienced people—the readiness of the military force really deals with experience and keeping these higher NCO's and officers in, I think, is a very important for combat readiness of the forces.

Mrs. **Heckler**. How would you evaluate the attitude of the military if one pay increase were to be passed by Congress and H.R. 1400 or something like it would be passed, which would get a little more than half a loaf in terms of the pay increase, you would get the 9-percent increase and you would get the retention benefits of prospective educational assistance under a proposal similar to H.R. 1400.

Would that be sufficient to make up for the disappointment over the earlier pay increase and the loss of it, and would it be sufficient to retain the people that we want to retain or recruit the people we want to recruit?

Private **Bogan**. I feel you hit another note, Ma'am. The second increase, the higher increase, I think would be more than sufficient if something else was compensated for, like the VEAP program, as you are talking about, the new GI bill.

Mrs. **Heckler**. The new GI bill?

Private **Bogan**. That's right.

Mrs. **Heckler**. I would like to ask any of the members of the panel, I would like to know how many of you came from families in which the military had a very important part, where you had relatives that were strongly involved in the military, and how many of you were motivated by family to serve?

You have already answered, and you have, in a sense, Private Hicks. The other three, were you impressed in terms of recruitment in the military because of the prior service of someone in the family?

Specialist **Rutherford**. It wasn't that I was highly impressed. I have two brothers who were previously in the service who were drafted in the Vietnam era, but I myself had considered going to a service before I got out of high school. But after high school I decided to try to go to college on my own, and it worked out for awhile but it was very hard to work full time and go to school full time.

And then after getting married, my wife and I discussed it and said, well this is one way for me to further my education and try to find, if I want to stay in the field which I had previously gotten in, which is computers, it's my trade but in the Army I am a medic. So I am feeling around, because when I came in I couldn't get that field.

Mrs. **Heckler**. You feel your background is not being utilized?

Specialist **Rutherford**. True.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Is that going to be a problem in making a military career?

Specialist **Rutherford**. I have given it quite a lot of consideration, but I am also in the process of feeling out other areas. Aviation is one of my interests and right now I am trying to fulfill that. If I complete that with no problem, I will be able to further my education on my own in the computer field.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Did you seek an opportunity to use your background in the Army.

Specialist **Rutherford**. Yes, I did.

Mrs. **Heckler**. There was no openings, is that correct?

Specialist **Rutherford**. Yes.

Mrs. **Heckler**. But you did go to the military because you wanted educational opportunities?

Specialist **Rutherford**. Educational opportunities, yes, among other things.

Mrs. **Heckler**. In the conversations that you had with your friends at the post, do you find that many of them were recruited because of educational opportunities in the military?

Specialist **Rutherford**. Quite a few were, but not the majority.

Mrs. **Heckler**. What recruited the majority?

Specialist **Rutherford**. Jobs.

Mrs. **Heckler**. There were no other jobs in the economy, therefore they chose——

Specialist **Rutherford**. Once high school graduates got out there was something different, there was a challenge to a point. I really can't speak for all high school students, but for some of them going into the military was like a steppingstone.

Mrs. **Heckler**. We have read so much about military families being forced to use food stamps. Have you actually experienced this at Fort Devens?

Specialist **Rutherford**. My wife is not with me because I haven't made enough to keep both of us on one income, but I have a few friends in the military who have to supplement their income with food stamps in order to survive, which to me is bad.

Mrs. **Heckler**. What will make you decide to commit yourself to a military career? You said you were not as of this point. What factor would influence you?

Specialist **Rutherford**. Factors that would influence me would be that I always have the consideration of my wife, educational benefits, pay, and my job itself. A lot of people get training on a certain job but they don't work in it, so it's discouraging to them. They try to compensate, they have the morale, the motivation, to keep going, but something isn't there; I can't really put my finger on it but it's just something that isn't there. It has a lot to do with their job.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Where is your wife at the present time?

Specialist **Rutherford**. In Missouri.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Corporal MacNeil, have you decided to make the military your career?

Corporal **MacNeil**. When I came into the military in 1979, my wife and I agreed we both wanted to stay, and she is very unhappy with it.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Why is that?

Corporal **MacNeil**. Because she had a baby in December and since December I have spent what she considers a large amount of time in the field, which takes a lot away from family life and leaves her alone in an apartment that she does not really feel secure in, with our families both far away—they are both in New York—she is insecure in feeling that I am gone as much as I am. It makes for a lot of hard feeling between us.

So when my time comes to ETS, I most likely will ETS.

Mrs. **Heckler**. If you had an opportunity to gain educational benefits, would that influence your decision to stay?

Corporal **MacNeil**. The education is important to me, but I would have to change my job in the Army. I would try for something else that would leave me out of the field more, so I could have a better relationship and a better feeling than I have right now.

Mrs. **Heckler**. What is your present job?

Corporal **MacNeil**. Well, I am combat engineer and the only training you get is by going to the field. Everything we do is done in the field, so that is where we have to go to train.

Mrs. Heckler. And do you stay in the field for a long duration of time?

Corporal MacNeil. Well, since the beginning of March I believe we have been in the field probably at least 15 to 20 days, it's just an approximation.

Mrs. Heckler. So the presence of educational benefits would not be a critical factor to your retention?

Corporal MacNeil. Like I said, I would have to get out of combat engineering and get into something that had a little less field duty. The education is a factor. But the education doesn't overweigh the hardship and inconvenience of the field unit.

Mrs. Heckler. No further questions.

Mr. Edgar. I would like to turn the microphone over to Barney Frank, who said some good things about you while you were out of the room, but we will let you read that on the record.

STATEMENT OF HON. BARNEY FRANK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Frank. I appreciate the chance to do this and I want to compliment the chairman for bringing it together. We spent a lot of time talking to higher ranking members of the armed services, and that is useful, particularly when we are talking about this kind of thing, but in general it is important for us to get the opportunity to talk to people like yourselves, and I am grateful to them for doing it.

I just would say, you needn't feel hesitant in suggesting that it would be bad for morale if you didn't get a pay raise, because Congress voted down its own pay raise last year out of necessity and it was terrible for morale. So don't feel hesitant about admitting that people don't like to lose dough, especially when they think it was coming to them. And in your case you needed it a lot more.

I certainly agree that there really is a very strong need for improving overall living conditions and I think it has been impressive, as this testimony has evolved, that basically you are reminding us—it's unfortunate to have remind us but I think it's useful—that people who serve in the Armed Forces are human beings. And the kind of considerations that are relevant to human beings are relevant to people in the armed services. It's a combination of things. It's training, it's educational opportunities, decent income, there are many factors.

But I just think that we shouldn't feel that because we are dealing with people in the Armed Forces, we are dealing with a whole different set of people.

I just have a couple of specific questions. But first, as you know, with regard to that and with regard to the need to improve living conditions in general, I was pleased I spoke to Colonel Kattar, since Fort Devens is in my district, and said what can I do to help out at Fort Devens in terms of military construction budget, and I wanted him to respond. And there wasn't anything in the budget for Fort Devens.

I wasn't sure if he was going to talk about something to do with the jump school or the water firing range or whatever, and he told me what his highest priority was and I am trying to get it into the military construction budget, it was the day care center.

I think that would be a very good reminder and indication of his awareness of the need to create the kind of living conditions where you are able to do your job without worrying. The day care center, for whose who do have small children where both spouses want to work. So that is something that I am hopeful we will be able to put into the budget for Fort Devens this year.

Let me ask you specifically corporal, you do some work on retention, do I understand?

Corporal **MacNeil**. I am reenlistment NCO.

Mr. **Frank**. Do you talk education with people when you are talking about it?

Corporal **MacNeil**. It's a basic part of the conversation that goes on between the two individuals.

Mr. **Frank**. Is this a tool that you are going to find very useful directly then?

Corporal **MacNeil**. It's another tool.

Mr. **Frank**. I understand that no one thing is going to do it for you people, any more than any other group. But do the people you talk to bring up education, or is it something you try to sell to them?

Corporal **MacNeil**. Most of the people, I think, that stay because of the job market outside, I think education, the majority of them it's just because they don't know what they want to do when they get out. And they want more time to think about it.

Mr. **Frank**. The similarities between being in the Army and being in Congress grow as you talk.

Corporal **MacNeil**. They don't really know what they want to do, and they are not that screaming out loud unhappy with what they are doing.

Mr. **Frank**. So education isn't something that is very much on their minds, but it is something that you would have to bring them up and sell them on the advantages of it?

Corporal **MacNeil**. One of the options they have when they reenlist is that they can pick up a school to change their MOS, to change their military job, and a lot of people go for that because it gives them another reenlistment and that gives them also a change of pace. For that time they go for that.

Mr. **Frank**. So it's an increased educational benefit then, it gives them one more option in terms of a future job?

Corporal **MacNeil**. Yes.

Mr. **Frank**. Private Bogan, what is going to decide whether you stay in or not?

Private **Bogan**. Mr. Frank, what will decide, I am sure, I will stay in the military intelligence field and I hope to go on to more advanced training, maybe not in my own field but I was thinking more of infantry skills later on, and just how my job would be carried out, how I feel about it at the time.

Mr. **Frank**. Private Hicks, how about yourself? What are the factors that are going to determine whether or not you decide to stay in?

Private **Hicks**. It will be part of the educational benefits given to the soldiers, and then again it's almost too far. I have just enlisted, I have 4 years to do so I really can't honestly say. It's based on how much schooling I get done personally between now and my ETS date.

Mr. **Frank**. We are trying to give some incentive to people who didn't get a high school degree or equivalent. Would all of you agree that it would be unfortunate to discriminate between people who had the degree and people who didn't in these programs?

Specialist **Rutherford**. Like I said, myself, I would think it was discriminatory if in a combat situation they showed discrimination, but in peacetime you would have the opportunity to get a GED or high school education. It woud be based on the programs the Army now has, and it would qualify him for the newer GI bill. But other than that, I totally can't say.

Mr. **Frank**. So as long as the opportunity is there, and they can then become eligible, there would be no problem with that?

Specialist **Rutherford**. Right, I don't see a problem.

Mr. **Frank**. That's all I have.

Mr. **Edgar**. I would like to thank all of you for participating this morning, and I hope you will stick around and listen to some of the other panelists.

And if your have additional comments you would like to make, feel free to jot them down and give them to us.

Let's move to the second panel of witnesses, Specialist Homes, Staff Sergeant Borges-Bonilla, Sergeant Ferguson, SFC Richard Reiman, CWO John Vargas.

I can tell by your medals that you are a little older than the last group.

Let's begin with Sergeant Borges-Bonilla, and we will go right down the line. Tell us a little about yourself, what your background is, what your specialty area is, and so forth, and then we will come back with questions.

STATEMENT OF A PANEL CONSISTING OF SPECIALIST HOLMES, STAFF SERGEANT BORGES-BONILLA, SERGEANT FERGUSON, SFC RICHARD REIMAN, AND CWO JOHN VARGAS, ALL OF THE U.S. ARMY

Staff Sergeant **Borges-Bonilla**. Mr. Chairman, I am Staff Sergeant Borges from 39th Engineer Battalion at Fort Devens. I am 25 years old, married, and I have a 2-year-old son. As supply sergeant, my job consists of supervising nine soldiers and logistical support, all incoming and outgoing supplies within the engineer battalion.

Prior to my military career I was a student at the University of Puerto Rico. I presently have 6 years in the Army. I have a second enlistment that will finish in May 1982.

Mr. **Edgar**. Very good.

Sergeant Ferguson?

Sergeant **Ferguson**. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. My name is Sergeant Ferguson. I am 23 years old. I am married, I have two children. I have been in the Army for 4½ years. I have been in Germany, Fort Gordon, Ga., and Fort Devens here. I am a mechanic; I supervise four mechanics.

Mr. **Edgar**. OK. Mr. Vargas?

Warrant Officer **Vargas**. Mr. Chairman, I am Warrant Officer Vargas. I am the installation food superviser and adviser at

Fort Devens. I have been at that job for 4 years. I am 35 years old. I have been in the Army 17 years. I am married, and have a 9-year-old son. I really don't have a brief description of my military career, because it would take too much of your time.

Mr. **Edgar**. Specialist Homes?

Specialist **Holmes**. Mr. Chairman, I am Specialist Holmes, my present job is battalion clerk. I am 27 years old and have been in the job for 11 months.

I have been in the service for 7 years. I am married with three dependents. I have had assignments at Gelhousen, Germany, from 1972 to 1976, Georgia from 1976 to 1978. I got out of the service in 1979 to 1980, and I came back in the Army in May of 1981 and was assigned to Fort Devens, Mass.

Mr. **Edgar**. OK. Sergeant Reiman?

Sergeant **Reiman**. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. I am Sergeant First Class Reiman. My present job is communications superviser on special forces A team. I have been in that job approximately 11 years. I am 32 years old, I have 14 years in the Army. I have two tours overseas.

Mr. **Edgar**. OK, let me ask some specific questions of you, and let me first ask a general question to all of you. I would like you to be honest as you can be.

What really bugs you about the Army? What is it that really gets you? What is it that makes you mad? What is it that makes you angry—besides Congressmen?

Warrant Officer Vargas, do you want to try to tackle that question? What is it that bugs you about the military? You have been in it for 17 years, you must know something about it. You have a brief history that is rather long.

Warrant Officer **Vargas**. There are officers and superior officers here and I wouldn't want to be put on the spot.

Mr. **Edgar**. We give you immunity for all statements at this hearing.

Warrant Officer **Vargas**. A lot of times I feel there is a lot of redtape in the Army that we must go through——

Mr. **Edgar**. Why don't you get a little closer to the microphone and say redtape real loud?

Warrant Officer **Vargas**. Well, to get to a person like you or people that you have to voice your opinions to is sometimes hard.

Obviously, I can't say too much about the Army bugs me, otherwise I wouldn't be in it for 17 years. So I am satisfied, and I really have no complaints about the Army.

Mr. **Edgar**. Sergeant Reiman, you have been in for 11 years in the Army?

Sergeant **Reiman**. Fourteen years.

Mr. **Edgar**. Fourteen years. How do you feel? What kind of gets to you when you think about it? Of course you have made the decision to stay and you are there for that 14 years, but you have seen other people around you who have just thrown up their arms and said, I've got to get out, I just can't stand this anymore.

What are some of the things that bug people? Why do they leave the military?

Sergeant **Reiman**. Well, sir, one problem is we always wait until—in the Army, Air Force, Navy—until problems arise and get to such a level, like right now. We are trying to salvage something, whereas when I first came in I had educational benefits and I still have them. Unless the law is changed I won't get full utilization.

However, it's education, one, then it was retirement. It was a set thing, you know. I came in 1967 and I knew in 20 years I could retire after 20 years of service. Then there was talk that we were going to change it.

And it's the people in Congress, it seems the military always gets hurt first, we are going to save money, so we are going to take away some benefits. Now that we don't have this strong force because so many people are leaving, you are going to entice us, you are going to give us this deal.

Well, the people in my category, OK they have said this, so what is going to happen? I am going to commit myself so maybe 10 years from now, that is going to be the first benefit that comes. We have to make a decision and more or less say if you enlist in this particular timeframe you will be guaranteed. It's too bad to put 15 years in the Army and lose your benefits, and the person has to make the decision, hey, I want my 4 years education and retirement.

Mr. **Edgar**. I really appreciate two of the things you have just said. One of the things we have not mentioned to date is this problem that in December of 1976 the Vitenam era GI bill terminated, and there was a 10-year delimiting date, so that after 3 years of service when that 10 years starts running, 1989 is that 10-year delimiting date, after which no one will be able to use their Vietnam era benefits.

One of the suggestions that has been made as an amendment to this bill is to change the language so that that 1989 date does not impact before we grandfather in those who were covered so that there would be no pressure for people like yourself to leave the service now or in the near future, so they could use the benefits they have accrued. We've gotten some testimony that there are some people who are feeling pressure to get out of the service so that they could use their benefits before the 1989 cutoff date. So I appreciate your raising that issue.

Probably more important than that issued, which is an important one, is the comment you made about stability. I wonder if anyone else wants to speak to this point. We have heard from people in Norfolk as well as people who came to our hearings in Washington that all of the test programs, the tests that are out there trying to discover whether education can work as a recruitment and a retention service, and a new program, the VEAP program, have given a great deal of uncertainty to what the level of benefits are.

One of the things that many of the recruiters have said particularly, is that they need in their tool chests to recruit people in the service a very stable, simple concept that they can offer people that they will feel are basic benefits that will not go up and down, will not be terminated, will not be juggled. All of the test veteran's programs and education programs give that uncertainty. They don't know who qualifies and who doesn't qualify.

Do any of you others feel strongly that the idea of stability, of knowing what your pay benefits are going to be, what your education benefits are going to be, are helpful not only in recruitment but in retention within the system? Does anyone want to speak on that?

[No response.]

Mr. EDGAR. Does anyone else want to speak to what bugs you about the military?

Let me move over to Warrant Officer Vargas.

Warrant Officer VARGAS. The only thing that really bothers me right now is like he was mentioning, like ending 1975, January 1975. I feel I have been pushed out of the Army, or take whatever you are going to give me, and I am not going to do it. It's just simple, people like me, NCO's are being pushed out because none of these benefits can compare to one that was stable, like the Vietnam era GI bill that is going to be cut off in December 1989.

There is no way I can put 20 years in the service, so why wait until 10 to get out, if I can do it earlier?

Mr. EDGAR. Well, you can twist the arms of three Members of Congress to change that law.

Warrant Officer VARGAS. That is what I am trying to do right now.

Mr. EDGAR. OK.

Let me focus now back on the whole concept of education as a recruitment tool and as a retention tool, whether or the provisions for recruitment retention you think will work or won't work, and whether or not you think the transferability provisions make some sense.

Who wants to speak to that? Sergeant Ferguson, do you want to comment on the bill itself? What do you think of it?

Sergeant FERGUSON. Well, sir, the transferability I happen to like a lot. I plan on staying in the Army and when I get out if I could transfer my benefits to my wife I would really like that. We have two children and she is going to spend all her time taking care of kids and not furthering herself. So I figure when I get out I would like to give her a chance to make her life.

Mr. EDGAR. Specialist Holmes?

Specialist HOLMES. Yes, sir?

Mr. EDGAR. What do you think about the provisions of an education bill? Do you think that we—you know, we terminated Vietnam era GI bill and we have some statistics that recruitment has dropped since then, the thought here being that if we put back a GI bill similar to but different in some respects to that GI bill that it will serve as a recruitment and retention measure.

Do you think that makes sense?

Specialist HOLMES. Yes, sir. I like the H.R. 1400 program. Of course I am under the old system, I got drafted in the Army. I think it's a good program.

Mr. EDGAR. Let me yield to my colleagues. I have a couple of additional questions, but I will yield to my colleagues for their questions.

Mrs. HECKLER. I would just like to ask a question about the caliber of new recruits. Do you see a difference in the type of person that is coming in the military today, and how would you characterize that?

I see a lot of heads nodding, I would like to get their comments.

Specialist **Holmes**. The caliber of people we are getting now are very educated.

Mrs. **Heckler**. The are?

Specialist **Holmes**. But they don't have any commonsense.

Mr. **Edgar**. Make sure we have that number of the record.

Mrs. **Heckler**. That is not unique to the Army. Don't ask about the caliber of newcomers to Congress. They are very fine in Massachusetts.

Specialist **Holmes**. But this is true, though, they are very educated, you've got to tell them to tie their shoelaces.

Mr. **Frank**. But you don't have to tell them how once you've done that.

Mrs. **Heckler**. You can train them.

Any comments about that, the caliber of newcomers, what are they like.

Warrant Officer **Vargas**. I have no comments.

Sergeant **Ferguson**. From what I have seen I think there's a lot of immature people coming in the Army, and I have seen a lot being thrown out that act like kids. I can't even see how they are even out of high school. I think before anybody comes into the Army they should at least have to finish high school. I didn't—well, I finished it in Germany—but I think there's too many immature people coming in.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Do you feel then that this bill, which would give educational benefits to someone who had finished high school might be likely to attract to the Army and recruit to the Army a more mature type of person, someone who is somewhat more motivated to continue in the service and to use the benefits.

Sergeant **Ferguson**. Yes, ma'am, I do. Personally, I think that after anybody finishes high school they should more or less be drafted. I think people should serve a couple of years in the service, I think that should be mandatory, and whatever they feel after that, either they can get out or they can build up their benefits or whatever.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Sergeant Borges?

Sergeant **Borges**. I agree with him, Mrs. Heckler, when he says that some kind of a military service should be mandatory, at least 6 months of training, or any training after completion of high school. Not a draft, just a nice vacation, 6 months with us.

Mrs. **Heckler**. A vacation in the Army.

How would you characterize the new recruits?

Sergeant **Borges**. Very immature.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Do you feel they should complete high school before they get into the military?

Sergeant **Borges**. Sometimes it doesn't make any difference if he has high school or not. They are just immature. The age doesn't help.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Many of you, or at least a number of the witnesses so far earlier in Norfolk talked about the difficulty of military life, which we are all familiar with.

Obviously, I have heard a new strain which I think is fortunate, and that is that military men are thinking about benefits for their wives, recognizing the contribution that the wife makes. This bill would allow the transferability of military benefits, educational benefits for those individuals in critical areas, critical skill areas.

Do you feel that that is a fair provision?

Sergeant **Borges**. No, Mrs. Heckler, I don't feel it is because you just said a word that means a lot, critical skills. This could be a group that right now may be getting all these benefits, so why give them some more? I think if we are going to give that benefit, let's give it to everybody or none. I don't think it's fair.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Are there other comments on the limitation of the transferability of the educational benefits to those individuals who are sought to be retained in critical skill areas? Is that a fair provision of the bill, is it wise? Any other comments?

Sergeant **Vargas**. I have a comment. Mrs. Heckler, the benefits should accrue for longevity as far as I am concerned. Also, I feel that transferability should be increased with longevity. And the reason why, if a person comes in the Army and he spends 7 months and all of a sudden he finds a neat way to get out of the Army, he is entitled to everything that we are, and we have a combination of 100 years, let's say. That's not fair.

But I do feel that if you put in your services and you commit yourself to *x* amount of years, that you should have the authority to transfer your entitlements to your dependents and spouse. I feel very strongly about longevity, though. I just thought I would make that point.

Mrs. **Heckler**. According to this bill, one would have to serve in the active military for 3 years, or be relieved for a medical disability and therefore be entitled under the bill to the educational benefits. But there is another proposal which was introduced by a former Secretary of the Navy, now Senator Warner, which would suggest a longer time frame for the benefits. He would not allow the benefits to accrue until one had served for 6 years.

Would you agree that the longer period would be desirable?

Sergeant **Vargas**. If we are looking for retention and we let them go after 3 years we haven't served our purpose.

Mrs. **Heckler**. The first purpose is recruitment, the second is retention.

Sergeant **Vargas**. Once we have them in, we have to provide them with something to keep them in. And if it's going to be education and you let them know at the beginning that longevity is what is going to count for you, then I think they will look toward the 12th year, or whatever it may be.

Mrs. **Heckler**. According to Senator Warner's version of the bill he would require that if the individuals serve 3 years in active duty with a 3-year commitment in the Active Reserves, and that after the first 3 years of service the individual would be qualified for 18 months of educational assistance, following that first 3-year period then as the individuals serve for a longer period, his entitlement would also increase.

Do you believe that that would be a better proposal than the proposal in this bill, which requires a 3-year commitment in active duty, which would then earn the 36 months training of educational assistance. Do you prefer the more extended version? I would like to hear other comments.

Sergeant **Vargas**. It's hard to say. I prefer the extended version of it.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Sergeant Borges, do you have a comment?

Sergeant **Borges**. Mrs. Heckler, the only thing I can see, like you said, is longevity, just increasing percentage in amount, either money or something like that, but the individual must serve at least 6 years, like you said, at least 3 active Army and 3 Active Reserve.

It will be enough, but the thing that we have to worry about, I think, is not only get the people in it, but retain them in the Army. And that means we are going to need a lot more of these, in other words, discussions to find out what is the requirement.

Mrs. **Heckler**. I would like to ask just one further question and that is: Is there a military wives association at Fort Devens?

Sergeant **Ferguson**. Yes, there is.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Fine. I hope we will have a chance to speak to some of the military wives and military husbands, if they are available. I want to give equal rights to the spouses of the women.

Mr. **Edgar**. I was hoping you were going to add spouses.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Naturally.

Mr. **Edgar**. Mr. Frank?

Mr. **Frank**. I am struck, Sergeant Reiman, by your very forceful statement about the instability and the sense that people have of having promises broken to them. I think you are right, and it's a terrible thing that has been done. The question I have is, to what extent it effects our credibility now.

We are talking about a new program, and what we are talking about is, in a sense, a new set of promises to people that if you join and if you stay in this and that will come. To what extent is our ability to make those promises believable been damaged to the extent that you and others no longer believe that?

Sergeant **Reiman**. I really can't tell you, maybe just the way it is worded and how they explain it that as of this date this will be effective.

Mr. **Frank**. Let me rephrase it. I didn't ask the question as well as I should have.

Am I correct that what you are saying is we do have that credibility problem and if we are going to make anymore promises we'd better try not simply to make them good in substance in the program, but we'd better pay attention to the fact that we've got a problem and some people might not believe us because they have been misled and let down before.

Sergeant **Reiman**. Yes, sir, I believe that.

Mr. **Frank**. Is that a general problem, do the others agree? Some of you have been in for awhile, do you have a sense you have been let down?

Sergeant, you mentioned that you think tradition has changed significantly between now and when you joined and you may get out earlier. Is that correct?

Sergeant **Borges**. That is my problem.

Mr. **Frank**. You said there have been changes between now and the time you enlisted sufficient so that they may cause you to leave earlier than you expected?

Sergeant **Borges**. Right, the GI bill.

Mr. **Frank**. If that changes, would you stay in?

Sergeant **Borges**. Yes, I may.

Mr. **Frank**. OK, you aren't sworn, you aren't under oath so it's not binding. You can get out again if you want to.

That, I take it, is a very important point for public policy, and again I am struck by the importance of some of these things in general, that you can't fool with people and give them one set of promises and another. I gather it is a general sense that people have that promises have been broken.

Let me ask you a related question. I hear from a number of the veterans' groups and the older veterans, but also some of the younger ones, so of the Vietnam era veterans, and they have been distressed by some of the budget cuts that have been proposed and some of the veterans' benefits programs, veterans' hospitals, counseling, job placement, and I am told some of these people feel that that could also have a negative effect on recruitment or retention, if people once again get the sense that promises made are being broken.

Is there any conversation or discussion about what happens to veterans' benefits? Does that have an effect on these decisions people make?

Are people on active duty generally aware of what is being proposed with regard to their veterans' hospitals or the other programs?

Sergeant **Borges**. Yes, we keep track of them.

Mr. **Frank**. So cutbacks there also have a negative effect on what we are doing?

Sergeant **Borges**. Correct.

Mr. **Frank**. I guess one of the lessons is that politicians ought to be a lot more careful about what they say, because you are listening. I mean, sometimes we get the comfortable sense that nobody hears us when we don't want them to, and I think that's an important point.

Specialist Holmes, I am just curious. You said you left and then come back. I don't want to pry into your personal life, but what persuaded you to come back in?

Specialist **Holmes**. To be honest about it, a retired major, me and him were good friends, and I used to do some work for him. I was self-employed when I got out, but I liked the Army, I liked what it stood for.

Mr. **Frank**. I think it's an impressive thing that someone who had the experience, it's a perfectly reasonable thing to try different modes in the Army, try the civilian sector and go back again. I think it speaks well for at least some of the Armed Forces aspects, to attract people.

That's all I have. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. **Edgar**. Let me just ask a couple of additional questions.

There is a report in today's newspaper about how we cope with the costliest city, and it talks about the Boston metropolitan areas. One of the paragraphs said, "and so Boston residents weren't jolted by U.S. Department of Labor report released yesterday that for the ninth straight year it gives Boston the dubious distinction of being the most expensive city in the continental United States for middle income families."

Do you feel the impact of that cost of living in this particular area? Who wants to respond to that? Is it tougher to live in the Boston metropolitan area, let's say, than some of the other places you have served because of the cost of living?

Specialist HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I am from Jackson, Tenn. I don't find it that much more expensive.

Mr. EDGAR. Anyone else find it more difficult, if you have served in other places? You do have the advantage, I guess, of shopping at a PX. It may have some benefit.

Let me ask the question in a slightly different way. Let's take yourselves out of uniform, out of the military, back in your local communities. One of the things that is in this particular bill is a common benefit for a GI who has served for 3 or 6 years, and that benefit will be given whether they live in Tennessee or whether they live in New York or Massachusetts or Illinois or California.

In certain parts of the country university education is free or at a very low cost. In other parts of the country, we have fairly high tuition—Harvard, Yale, University of Pennsylvania, Lycoming College in Williamsport, Pa.—that is where I graduated, one of the biggies—but the cost of tuition is very high.

Can any of you speculate—you know, you have left the service, you are now about to use either your Vietnam-era benefits or a new benefit that is provided you. Do you think there is some inquity at the fact that the benefit levels are the same across the country and that someone going to a free-tuition school will get the same exact benefits you get if you get to a school of a higher caliber? Not higher caliber, but higher expense?

Specialist HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, let met give you a example. When I got out I was going to go to a trade school in Jackson. I went there and applied for it under the GI bill. I was denied this because they didn't have the—well, they had the course but it was in the day and I would have to go at night. I was denied this in Houston too.

Mr. EDGAR. So what are you saying?

Mr. FRANK. Could you explain that again? You couldn't take the course?

Specialist HOLMES. I could not take the course because I had to be there in the morning, and I was working in the morning so I would only be able to go at night.

Mr. EDGAR. So what is the illustration, what is the point?

Specialist HOLMES. On using the GI bill.

Mr. EDGAR. Are you saying it should be more flexible?

Specialist HOLMES. Yes, it should.

Mr. EDGAR. What do you others feel about the regional cost of living, and the regional cost of going to education? Do you feel there ought to be, for example, a tuition kicker within the bill that up to so much of tuition would be covered, and those schools that don't have tuition would not get any money, but those that do would get let's say $1,000 or some percentage of tuition?

Let's go to Sergeant Borges.

Sergeant BORGES. I don't believe in that because it's kind of unfair. Nobody makes you go to a certain college, it's up to you to go to what college you want to go to. The only thing I can say is, if we are talking about money you just draw a line in between, but don't go astray,.

To tell you the truth, right now the good thing about the Vietnam-era GI bill is it doesn't matter how much you pay, so the money you get, you know you are planning to support your family with it. If you are going to go just for fees, you won't be serving any purpose.

Mr. EDGAR. What about both? What about a basic fee that everyone would get, and then a tuition kicker that would be a percent of the tuition in particular schools to assist those who would go to a school that has higher tuition?

Sergeant BORGES. Then I say the same thing again, don't just go by the school, but draw an average and then give the same amount of everybody. It's there choice, nobody makes them go to a certain college.

Mr. EDGAR. Very good.

Let me thank this panel for their comments.

Let me just say to those who have not testified as of yet, you have heard most of the basic questions, we have covered a lot of the issues. And I would appreciate it, as you have introduced yourself, if you have a comment that you particularly would like to make on any of the provisions we have talked about, or additional provisions, or suggestions you would like to make on how to draft an education bill, I would appreciate it if you would bring that to our attention as you are introduced.

The committee will stand adjourned for 5 minutes.

[A short recess was taken.]

Mr. EDGAR. The subcommittee will come to order.

The 5 minute break turned into a congressional break of 5 minutes and we simply changed the clock.

Lets' go down, we'll start with Colonel Miller and go to his right and then to his left. You have heard many of the questions in which we have laid out many of the issues, and if you have a specific point or several points you would like to make, why don't you make them in your introductory comments and then we will come back to questions. Congressman Frank has had to leave, so it will just be Congresswoman Heckler and myself.

Colonel Miller?

STATEMENT OF A PANEL CONSISTING OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL MILLER, MAJ. LINDA KIEFER, LT. KATHERINE SARVARY, CAPT. GABRIEL ACOSTA, AND CAPT. FELIX BLINN, ALL OF THE U.S. ARMY

Colonel MILLER. All right, sir. I am Lieutenant Colonel Miller. I command the 39th Engineer Battalion at Fort Devens. I am 38 years old and have been in the Army for almost 17 years. I graduated from the Military Academy in 1964, and was commissioned second lieutenant, Corps of Engineers, I attended Ranger School at Fort Benning, Ga., and served 3 years in Germany, 12th Engineer Battalion, where I was a combat engineer platoon leader, combat demolitions munitions platoon leader, a special weapons staff officer, and commander of a combat engineer company.

I then served in the Republic of Vietnam, again with a combat engineer battalion, 15th Engineers, 9th Infantry Division. There again I commanded a combat engineer company and served as a battalion assistant operations officer.

Following my tour in Vietnam, I went to the Engineer Officers Advanced Course at Fort Belvoir, Va. I was sent to the University of Illinois to obtain a master of science degree in theoretical and applied mechanics. I then served 3 years as an instructor and assistant professor of mechanics at the Military Academy. I attended the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and then again another 3 year tour in Germany with the same unit, 12th Engineers, 8th Infantry Division, where I served as the battalion operations officer for 9 months and battalion executive officer for 2½ years.

I returned to the United States in 1978 and served as an assistant professor in military science at MIT here in Cambridge. I have commanded the 39th Engineer battalion since December of last year.

I have had a good military career to date. I am very satisfied with it. My family and I like the military, we like the military life. I am married, I have three young ladies ages 15, 12, and 8. Under a Massachusetts State program for foster care we are picking up a fourth daughter who is 13 and I am happy to have the opportunity to speak with you today about the proposed legislation.

I do have several items I would like to address. Do you want me to go ahead and do that now?

Mr. Edgar. Why don't you do that now, and we will go through each person in the same way.

Colonel Miller. All right, sir.

My concerns on the GI bill are on several levels. I am concerned for my soldiers, and what the GI bill is going to mean to them. I am concerned just as a citizen with what the GI bill will mean to recruitment and retention and quality of the force.

And then, of course, on a personal level I am interested in what the GI bill means to me. I think it's extremely important that we hold out an attractive carrot in the recruiting arena to entice the quality of soldier that we need to run the force today. I am speaking of the educatable soldier, the one that can go to college. And I think that an attractive GI bill will accomplish that, will bring into the force the kind of solider that we need to have.

In addition to recruiting the quality soldier, once we get him into the service, there is a certain percentage of those folks that we would like to keep in the service. Now as they progress through their career, we don't need to keep all of them, obviously, because we are a pyramid organization and fewer folks need to be retained.

But we do need to retain the quality soldier. Again, we don't want the quality soldier to be leaving the service so we again need retention. I am not convinced that the provisions of this bill will adequately retain the type of people that we want to retain.

Mr. Edgar. What level of benefits would be adequate?

Colonel Miller. It's very difficult for me to say—to put a dollar figure on, sir. As I said, I was assistant professor of military science at MIT and during the 2½ years I was there I watched the tuition in the four schools I was dealing with—MIT, Harvard, Tufts, and Wellesley—increase over $1,000, just tuition. And their tuition now is in the vicinity of $7,000 apiece a year, and when you add in room and board and other items, you are talking about $10,000 a year—at least at those quality schools—to educate one person.

I am not sure that the benefits that we are offering are going to be attractive enough to bring those quality people into the service and to retain them. We are talking of a $3,000 package for 3-year service, and about a $7,000 package for 6-year service under this legislation.

And as has been mentioned before, I can see a need not just to cover the tuition costs, but this is in general the primary breadwinner we are talking about and he needs to be able to support his family while he is doing this. And if he has stayed in the Army 6 years, he is probably married, he probably has several children and it's very difficult for him as a primary breadwinner to go to school when the entire benefit package goes to tuition.

I think what we are saying is, if you will come in the Army and serve in the Army for 3 or 6 years, or whatever we are going to set the limit, we will give you a college education. We will make sure that you get that. I don't think this package is going to guarantee that.

I am concerned about some of the strings that are attached to the legislation. My major concern is over the critical skills restriction and the shortage skills restriction. Every soldier that serves is serving in a position that the Army needs or we wouldn't have that position.

They suffer the same sacrifices, they make the same commitments, and I think they should all be treated the same. I think the benfits should apply across-the-board to all soldiers. Assuming that we have a good GI bill package that will attract the youngsters into the service, the quality youngsters, the college educatable ones, then we need provisions that will insure that we can retain the quality folks through to 20 years retirement and beyond 20 years retirement, for the folks we want to retain that long.

I like the in-service use provision, or the possibility of that, I think is a good provision, provided that we in the service arrange for the soldier to be able to use it. We can's ask him to work 10 or 12 hours a day and then expect him to use his nights and his weekends to go to school, or to prepare for his classes. I think that is unreasonable.

I am personally in favor of a bootstrap program where if a soldier can reach a certain level of college education then the Army will say, "hey, we'll send you to school, to college, for a year or 18 months at our expense; we will pay the tuition and we will continue to pay your salary. Obviously, you have an obligation when you finish, a further obligation, but we will let you finish your college degree."

The leave of absence provision I think is good, not as good as the bootstrap program but to give the soldier time off from the Army to use his benefits and then come back into the service.

I am not familiar with the loan forgiveness program, but I would think that if we can give a soldier a loan to go to school and then forgive that for a period of service that that too would be an attractive provision.

What I think we need to do is encourage soldiers in sufficient numbers to stay in the service so we can be selective about who we retain, so that we don't have to take anybody that wants to stay, and we can say, "we are going to keep only you guys that are the best."

The transferability option, I think, is probably the best innovation I have seen in a long time, and for somebody in my position particularly it looks attractive. However, the provisions in this bill are of no value to me. I see many of my contemporaries—I am a 17-year serviceman now, I will be approaching 20 years service when I complete this tour. At that time, I am going to have to make some hard choices.

My career progression to date has been good, and I have done all the good things I am supposed to do: the Army thinks I'm great because they have sent me to Leavenworth and they have given me the battalion command and that sort of thing. I think they want to retain me in the service beyond 20 years, but I have to look at the fact that since I am a Vietnam era veteran my benefits run out in 1989 and if I want to use them, I am going to have to get out.

Now the 8- to 12-year window that is built in this bill doesn't apply to me. I am already in 17 years, so I can't transfer my benefits to my children. That is what I would like to do. I have three young ladies that are all going to go to college, maybe four young ladies that will all go to college.

It would be very attractive to me to be able to fund their education out of my benefits. That would help, and I wouldn't have to make that hard choice. The choice that I have to make is, that if I don't get out at 20 years, or 21 years, or 22 years, that I am not attractive to industry because they won't be able to use me for 20 years and I am sure that is what they would like, if they are going to hire me.

I have many contemporaries who are making that choice now and are retiring after 20 years service. The Army should retain those folks. Because there are big bucks out there, and people who are most qualified, who we would like to keep in the service, are also the people who are most attractive to business and industry, who have served in leadership positions, who have done the management things that are attractive to industry. I think I'd better stop there so I don't take up too much time.

Mr. **Edgar**. Major Kiefer?

Major **Kiefer**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Maj. Linda Kiefer. I have been in the service for almost 12 years now, so I too am phasing out of the proposed window for the transferability.

I am 33 years old, have a 3-year-old son. I am in the Army Nurse Corps. During my career I have served in assorted clinical and administrative nursing positions in hospitals and clinics ranging from various places within the United States to Vietnam and Germany and back again. At the moment, I am chief nurse at a combat support hospital at Fort Devens.

It's hard to follow an act like Colonel Miller. I think he has hit upon all of the concerns that I had about the bill. I would like to reiterate a couple that I think are of particular concern, primarily what he was discussing as far as the transferability clause being applicable only to new people coming in, in essence, or people new to their career.

I have talked to a lot of senior NCO's before coming here. Many of them think the transferability would be the answer to their prayers for educating their children. They don't have the money put away to do it. Many are not particularly interested in educational benefits themselves. The GI benefits are going to run out before they can really take advantage of them, but this new bill, as it's proposed, would not benefit them either.

I think very strongly that to retain those people who are extremely vital to us, you need some sort of a grandfathering system to get them under some umbrella.

That is really my primary concern. There are a lot of little management problems that I could see, becoming enormous management problems. The critical skills issue, of course, would be a source of quite a bit of irritation in determining who is in critical skills. I tend to agree with Colonel Miller that for fairness sake there should be no distinction. It would create, I think, an awful lot of shuffling around of people trying to get into critical skill areas so designated, to obtain the benefits, and would tend to detract from the skill level of people you have in those fields.

We already have a lot of people doing MOS jumping and you end up with a fair number of senior people who don't know as much as they should about the career field they are in. I think this might tend to aggravate that situation.

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you.

Lieutenant Sarvary?

Lieutenant **Sarvary** Mr. Chairman, my name is Lt. Katherine Sarvary. I have been in the military for 1 year. Presently I am 23 years of age and I am single. This is my second duty assignment. I have been at Fort Devens for about a month.

I am presently acting as the executive officer of the military police company, which is basically assisting the commander in the smooth running of the company, and acting as the commander when he is not present. I was previously stationed in Germany where I served as a platoon leader for the MP company there.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask you a question. On this new bill, what about the people that are presently in the military who do not qualify for the old GI bill? Will they be compensated in any way? What I am getting at is, according to this new bill, you have to reenlist for 3 years or 6 years in order to qualify for it. What about the people who are already in? Are they going to be covered by any type of benefits at all?

Mr. **Edgar**. According to the new bill, they are not covered. They are not grandfathered in. There has been some testimony in Washington, and also down in Norfolk, to provide a provision to fill the gap between October 1, 1981, when this bill would take effect and those who came in after the December 31, 1976, date and grandfather those persons in.

I have to tell you that the drafters of the bill—and I was not present at the drafting of the bill, and I want to speak to a couple of points that the colonel and the major have made which I disagree with in the bill, and I will share that in a moment—the drafters of the bill were drafting a bill that was trying to provide adequate benefits but meet the tenor of the new administration; that is, cutting budgets and not looking for any new authorizations for 1981 or 1982 funding. They wanted to keep the up-front-year cost of the bill as low as possible.

Therefore, if you come to the conclusion that you want to grandfather in everyone who is presently in the service and begin benefits immediately for those who have had 3 years of service, and begin transferability of benefits immediately then you have to measure up the millions or billions of dollars that would be in the first year benefits. You have to make that part of this year's budget, and that is an incredibly difficult task.

It is going to be difficult enough to get a GI education bill through a Congress that is looking at budget cuts, rather than budget additions. We do have one saving grace, and that is in the defense area there are fairly substantial increases. Unfortunately, those increases are almoste entirely in the heavy equipment area, and not in the people area, and that is basically where we are.

But the present bill, H.R. 1400, is flawed in that it does not have a grandfathering clause.

Lieutenant **Sarvary** I can appreciate your position on the budgetary problems, as far as providing an umbrella for everybody. This is my opinion, and as I was heading for the door for this meeting I was called by quite a few individuals and they wanted me to express their opinion too.

I am under the belief that it would be a slap in the face to a lot of individuals who have served in the military and who are not benefiting from any type of GI bill right now. I am gearing my comments more toward junior enlisted people than myself. I have been able to attend college, so I do have some quality education behind me, whereas we have a lot of people who are coming right out of high school who haven't benefited from that.

I feel the people who have been in 2 or 3 years ought not have the full extent of the new GI bill. However, they should be compensated in some way. I feel that that would aid in the retention of some of the service people in the military now, because we are talking about hard feelings coming in the future if they see somebody coming in who automatically starts to benefit from a new GI bill. And they say, well, I am not getting anything, I've already served the military well for 2 or 3 years, and that might be enough to make them get out.

That's about the extent of my comments.

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you for your comments.

Captain Acosta?

Captain **Acosta**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Capt. Gabriel Acosta. I am currently the executive officer for the 2d Battalion, the Intelligence School. Prior to that I was an AIT training commander for 15 months.

I feel that I am quite able to look both at the retention for the noncommissioned officer and junior officer level, and also make any comments on how they feel about the educational benefits and some of the things that I personally experienced in dealing with them.

As a company commander, one of my responsibilities was to counsel the individual when he wished to withdraw from the program. It is my opinion that a lot of the soldiers coming in today are not concerned with education at that time. Most of the soldiers I had are fresh out of high school, they came in the service to get away from school. They are not looking at 2 or 3 years from now; they are looking at today.

They feel that the money they were putting in was being wasted, and they wanted to withdraw. I came in in 1967, I was enlisted for 4 years and I used part of my GI bill to go back to school and get my commission. So I feel that the GI bill in the Vietnam era is still quite beneficial. I have several contemporaries who fell under the same program, but I am seeing the junior officer today decide to leave because he feels he is not going to benefit from it. He can go to Digital or some of these companies and get further education because the company will pay for it and still give him an adequate salary.

I feel that we should target into that. I also feel that in retention, especially midlevel NCO's we've got to improve the quality of life. It's very hard to induce a staff sergeant or a young sergeant to stay in the Army when he sees that the private is living on approximately the same level as him, especially if he is single and he sees if he were married and of rank he could qualify for a house or something like this. To me, these are a lot of the reasons why people are getting out.

They have job satisfaction, but they feel they are not being treated with the privileges which should be commensurate with their rank. In my duties as the executive officer I deal with them today, trying to keep them in, to keep up with the industrial market. We train, we spend hundreds of thousands of dollars training technicians only to see them leave after 1 year. This isn't cost effective and it lowers morale. I again thank you for the opportunity to testify here, and hope that the panel does come up with a good GI bill.

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you.

Captain Blinn?

Captain **Blinn**. I am Capt. Felix Blinn. I am 33 years old, and 15 of those years I have spent in the infantry. I am married, I have three children, two daughters and a son ages 6, 4, and 2. As an infantryman, I deal with specifics: I deal with people; I deal with training.

To build an Army you've got to have people. You can build equipment, you can spend capital on equipment but it takes time and it takes a lot of effort to train people. Any programs we do to build the Army has to look at what we are going to have to do first to get quality people into the military, into the Army. And once you get them in there, to keep them in there.

There are four time periods when we have to influence people. One is when they first come out of high school. Most of them who come into the military at that time are not really interested in education. They are looking at today. Many of them are tired of school. They want to get out.

To bring them into the military you give them challenge, money, with perhaps a hint for those who may be thinking of college in the future that there is something down the road.

The next problem is that the 4-year mark, or the 3-year mark, when it's time for that first reenlistment. We talked about today a transfer to the 8- to 12-year mark for people with critical skills or shortage skills; now one of the purposes of our personnel management is to eliminate problems like that. It's hard to go to a young soldier, 21 years old, probably single, no children, and tell him, "if you enlist with us now, in 5 to 9 years, if you get married, if you have children, and if the Army fails to recruit enough people to eliminate your critical skill, then we will be able to give you a transferable benefit." If you promise to do something for us now, maybe we will do something for you in the future. I am not sure that is going to be all that good a selling point.

Again, I say I deal with specifics. There have been a lot of words said today about losing people, losing quality people out of the military. When I came in, I picked up all the handouts and I also brought a few handouts for you.

[Hands papers to members.]

Captain Blinn. These are two pages of something called a Friday report, which is a personnel status report. These show in my unit people we are currently losing between now and the 1st of June. I would like to turn your attention to about the middle of the page, there is a solider there by the name of Powell. I have known him for a couple of years now. He came to Special Forces from a Ranger battalion. Special Forces qualified, Ranger qualified, excellent physical condition, probably one of the finest young infantry soldiers we have in the Army today. He got out last week to go back to college.

If you turn to the back page, the first name there is Moore, sergeant first class in the Army. He made E-7, which is the senior NCO range, with less than 10 years of service, what we refer to as a top 5 percenter. A special forces medic, it takes over 1 year to get someone trained to be a Special Forces medic, plus the years of experience he has. He got out to go back to college.

On that page are also four other Special Forces medics coming off A teams and going—not all of them are going immediately back to college. This is just a 6-week period, and this is constant. If we lose a soldier to another unit that is no problem, because every soldier that we lose to another unit we gain a soldier from another unit, but we are losing soldiers out of the Army.

Earlier we had another sergeant first class who spent 11 years on the job. Special Forces has a reputation around the country and around the world of being very good at its job. One of the reasons for that is the stability we have. We have soldiers who have worked in the same job in the team for 6, 8, or 10 years. They know their jobs inside and out. When you start replacing people every 2 or 3 years, you can't gain that stability, and that's a problem.

So we've got to get people to reenlist at the end of that 3- or 4-year mark. Probably the biggest incentive as a group, overall, is a different assignment, a different place to go, a different type of training. He is in the Army, he now knows a little bit about the Army. When he first came in what he knew, unless he came from a military family, is basically what he read or what he got from a recruiter. Now that he has been in the Army for 3 years, he is able to zero in on exactly what he wants to do. So he will reenlist for something like that, or for reenlistment bonuses. So we've now got him to reenlist once, but we still don't have him for the long haul.

At about the 6- to 8-year mark, he becomes eligible to reenlist again. Now he's got experience in one field. It really isn't cost effective, or probably that much interest to put time into a completely new field. We now have to satisfy him in that area again. We have identified him in a specific field.

Money is always of interest, but the Army cannot afford to compete directly with industry. We've got to come up with some other things, some other satisfactory things. We can't constantly go into a bidding war. At 6 or 8 years he is married or thinking about being married. I got married at my eighth year of service. Prior to then I wasn't too interested in college for dependents. Now it's something I've got to think about. Now he is reading this stuff.

We need to give him a firm commitment: Yes, you stay the 20 years, this is what you are going to get. No maybes, no promises, specifics. You do this for us, we will do this for you." You've got to give something to get something in this life. We do this, we give him a deal, a transfer. He's got a wife; he's got children. Somewhere along the line he is going to have to worry about educating them.

As a father and mother there are really only three things you can do for your children. Teach them the difference between right and wrong; bring them up in a family and teach them that they are loved; and give them the best education you can afford. If we are going to keep these soldiers in, one of the best ways we can do is help them with one-third of their responsibility as a father, as a husband.

"Transfer payment, no strings attached. You stay in 20 years, these are the benefits we are going to give you." What they are in dollar amounts, we have to look at what we can afford, and give the most we can afford.

At the 20-year mark we run into the fourth and final problem. We are losing a lot of people at 20 years. I am due to retire in 1986. That gives me 3 years to use my GI bill. I have used some of it now. I came in 10 days out of high school; this June I will be halfway through a master's degree. It is possible to do it in the military, but it's a long and it's a rough haul doing it nights and weekends.

One of the things we can do to get him to reenlist at 20 years is make something like an education for reenlistment. The guy is enlisting the second time; he's already got 6 to 8 years in; he has already indicated that if he enlists again he might go for the 20 and go for the retirement.

If he wants to go to college at that time, people—and we are losing people at that time period—Sargeant Moore is a prime example, and there were more last month, E-6's and E-7's getting out, let him reenlist for college. He goes out, he gets accepted to a college. He reenlists for 6 years, we give him a 36-month break in service. He goes out to college, assigned to a Reserve, a National Guard unit, and he gets the educational goals he set for himself.

Then he comes back to us, better educated. Perhaps he will find out he doesn't like college, that isn't what he wants. Well then he comes back to us.

We seem to get the impression if a soldier doesn't reenlist when you want him to, we are so offended by the fact that we didn't offer him any money because he didn't fall into the right program, we didn't offer him any benefits because he didn't fall into any program. We let him go somewhere else to a different assignment, maybe not his first, second, or third choice. Then we are offended. We are losing quality people.

Make it easier for the quality people, if they do get out, to come back in. Keep a string on them, so that 3 years down the road they know they've got to make a decision to get out, not make a decision to come back in. It's always easier to avoid a decision, to make it easier for them, to show something.

At the 20-year mark we need to take a look. How do we keep them beyond 20 years? About 9 months ago I was talking to another senior NCO. He made the comment he was going to get out at 20 years and nothing would keep him in beyond 20.

I asked if he had any children. He said he had two. How old will they be when he is eligible for retirement? One would be high school, one would be graduating from high school. I told him, Congress is looking into a couple of educational programs, one of which would allow you to transfer your GI benefits to your children. Would that keep you in beyond 20 years? He said, "I have to think about that one."

About a year and a half ago I was going through some training. We had a senior NCO working who was over 20 years, ready to retire. But he was holding off on putting his retirement paper in because he had been alerted to go to an assignment with an ROTC group at one of the colleges, a college that had a program where dependents of faculty got free tuition. He was waiting to see if he got that college assignment because he had a daughter who was a senior in high school, and he wanted to put her through college. His intentions were, if he got the ROTC assignment, to stay in.

The civilian sector is coming up with their own GI bill. These are problems we have, getting people and keeping people. Whatever program we come up with has to address all these, the four key times we've got to influence people. We need something that influences them then.

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you very much. Each of you in this panel has been very articulate in your comments and, I think, gain from hearing some of the questions that were raised in the earlier panel. So I don't personally have as many questions to ask.

I did want to ask Colonel Miller how you create three little girls. I have three little boys and we have been trying and it's very difficult.

Colonel **Miller**. I am sure I could ask you the same question the other way.

Mr. **Edgar**. Coloner Miller and Major Kiefer, both of you talked about the 8- to 12-year window of the transferability provision. I happen to think that that was put in for a particular reason, to get the middle level NCO's to stay within the system.

I think we ought to settle on a particular year where the transferability provisions kick in, and not have it a window. I think it's important to provide that.

I also think, and this is just a personal view—I don't know whether I am going to be able to convince my colleagues of this when we amend the legislation and mark it up—that we ought to eliminate the critical skills issue because I think we've got enough testimony here and in Norfolk that all skills can be critical at a particular time in military service, and to set up rules and regulations as to how and who is critical. I have to say that that will impact on the budget considerations down the line because with everyone being covered by the transferability provision, it will jack up the cost considerably, but I think it's an investment well made.

So I just wanted to be on record, so that you knew where I was coming from on that issue.

And, Captain Blinn, you were particularly helpful in going through the period. I ask unanimous consent that this document which you have given to us will appear in the record, and without objection we will make this a part of today's testimony.

I would also say that there has been a lot of discussion about the very thing that you raised, and that is the leave-of-absence provision. And you have said, in terms of a reenlistment, to provide an education for someone to see whether they want to get their education. Colonel Miller mentioned getting his master's degree while in the service, which would be an encouragement to do that if he would stay.

Some suggested a little extra bonus for the leave-of-absence provision, to make sure that they come back in and provide some benefits. I think all of your comments have been helpful. Most of them will tone the legislation one way or the other, and within the budgetary constraints and the pressures we have in Washington, I think you all made a contribution.

I would like to yield now to Mrs. Heckler.

Mrs. **Heckler**. I want to say that I agree with the chairman in terms of the comments to the panel. You have been excellent.

I am delighted, Captain Acosta, that you have been able to use the Vietnam era benefits, it is one that I worked on for several years and consequently worked to improve. Colonel Miller also mentioned it. It is very important and I am always pleased to have it utilized.

Obviously, there are two specific parts of this legislation. If we could, we would do everything for everyone obviously. We are living in a period where we see constraints everywhere. At the same time we would like to be able to make the All-Volunteer Force a success, and we find that we are not attracting the right caliber and the right number of people as these particular levels initially.

Now is seems to me that since we are targeting the bill for the recruitment of bright, motivated people to go in the military and to use educational benefits as a stimulus, as an inducement to military service, there seems to be some disagreement on your part, Captain Acosta. You said quite clearly that you did not feel that educational benefits would be an inducement at that early stage of initial recruitment.

Now whether that, indeed, is an effective part of the bill I wonder. I want you to clarify this because I am perhaps confusing some testimony with that of the prior panel. Would you say that the educational assistance provisions of this bill would be a recruitment incentive, or should we go back to the draft?

Colonel **Miller**. Yes, ma'am, I would love to address that. I think the comment was made that the soldiers that we have in the Army now, the ones that we have recruited in the last 3 years, are not interested in furthering their education. In many cases they dropped out of high school to join the Army.

Mrs. **Heckler**. So we need to recruit a different type of——

Colonel **Miller**. Yes, ma'am, that is exactly the point. That is why I think that a new GI bill that does offer these benefits is a very, very strong inducement to enlist. I came in the Army back in the era when there was a powerful GI bill in force, and I know that I has many, many soldiers that came in the Army specifically for the purpose of gaining GI bill benefits, so they could then leave the service and use their benefits.

I think it is very definitely a very strong recruitment incentive.

Mrs. **Heckler**. So that you feel it would succeed?

Colonel **Miller**. Yes, ma'am.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Would be likely to succeed in terms of the major problem of the All-Volunteer Force right now, which is the lack of personnel, problem No. 1——

Colonel **Miller**. Yes; problem No. 1. And then the college educatable people.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Exactly. So you are dealing with a certain type of soldier now and you want to recruit people of that caliber.

Then the second point is the transferability—appears to be the most attractive feature of the bill, in terms of the retention of the kind of people we need. The critical skills designation, that does seem discriminatory, although we hear testimony in Washington that certain bonuses are already paid to those in critical skills.

So that separating for special treatment is not a new concept that this bill has introduced. It is the follow-through on what is already in practice. The point is, this does create resentment and possibly a jockeying for new positions and assignments in order to qualify for that.

What do you think would be a fair—I know we are running out of time here--what would be a fair standard, what requirements should be placed on the eligibility or transferability of benefits? How many years should the individual be required to be in in order to have the transferability provision available to him or her? What would you say?

Colonel **Miller**. I think when we are talking transferability, we are talking about the person who has already said, I am not going to go back to school myself, or I've already got my education but I need it for my wife and for my children. And these are people who I think have already committed themselves to staying in the Army to retirement. So I think it's to induce the 20-year retiree or beyond. Where do we kick it in, I don't know.

Mrs. **Heckler**. When would you say we put it in, Captain Blinn?

Captain **Blinn**. For the best benefit of the Army, give it to the soldier who has already reached 20 years, give it to him if he is serving beyond 20 years and has children or has served to 30 years and retired and has children.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Would you agree with that, Captain Acosta?

Captain **Acosta**. I would like to see it put in earlier. I think that maybe it is at the 10-year mark that the soldier makes a very firm commitment that he is going to make the Army his career, and I feel at that point he can look forward to it.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Do you have a comment, Major Keifer? Do you agree with that?

Major **Keifer**. I essentially agree with that. I think at some point prior to 20 years, although we do need something, some sort of an incentive to keep the exceptionally good people beyond 20, I don't know that this is the type of program to do it with. I don't think it is.

Mr. **Edgar**. I want to apologize to you for not having more time to spend with your comments, because I think we have gained a great deal from your input, and I hope you will continue to give us that input.

What I would like to ask you is, and even those in the audience who have already testified, is to go back and in the next week or so put yourself in the role of a Congressperson of the United States. You probably know more about this bill than most Members of Congress who do not serve on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

You also know more about the military than most Members of Congress, some of whom have not served in the military. It would be helpful if you went down the list of benefits provided, and you select the amount of money that should be provided in the first tier, in the second tier.

You suggest what year the transferability should kick in and at what amount and how, and deputize yourself to be Congresspeople of the United States. We don't elect the brightest and best in Congress, we elect average people from across the country who get more than half of the their constituents to elect them. Consider yourself elected for a period of time on this issue, and write your own GI education bill as you have in terms of some of your testimony.

What would it look like? What would it's shape be? We can put it in legalese language, we can put it in legislative form, but would be helpful because in the next 3 or 4 weeks we will be drafting the first attempt to pass a GI education bill.

It still has to go through the Armed Services Committee, is still has to go through the Senate, it still has to make its way to the President's desk and the President still has to be encouraged to sign it. We, I think, have gotten enought testimony to indicate that an education bill should be written. The shape and form and direction is still in some question, and I think with your expertise it would be helpful if you could do that for us.

Thank you for your testimony.

I am going to shift gears just a little bit at this point. We were intending to bring the recruiter panel up next, but rather than doing that I am going to ask the recruiters to wait and be the next to the next panel, and I would like the 16 members of the Air Force to come up and gather around the front here. Please leave room for our reporter to see you, so she is able to recognize your names.

But let's form a half moon semicircle up front here.

Mr. **Edgar**. Let us begin, and I feel a little bit like Jonny Carson going out into the audience. We are not trying to shortchange the

Air Force. In fact, when we were in Norfolk we had equal number of panels of Air Force personnel with the Navy. In fact, when the hearing record is finished, the Air Force will have more pages of testimony than any other of the military forces.

So I wanted all of you to understand that. We were intending to put you up in two or three separate panels today, but because of the pressure today it is going to be impossible to do that.

It doesn't mean that your input isn't going to be helpful, and I think all of you have heard a great deal this morning about the GI education bill and its particular problems. As you know, the Air Force is different from the Army, with different years of commitment and different types of people who enter the Air Force under certain circumstances, and for different reasons.

I would like us, if we could in a few moments, to glean some information and testimony from all of you. Let's go around the room and do introductions without comments on the bill at first, so that we have on the record all of your names, your specific skills, how many years you have been in the service, where you are from, and we will do that quickly around the room and then we will come back to the issue of education.

Let's start over here with Mr. Cook.

STATEMENTS OF A PANEL CONSISTING OF A1C. MICHAEL J. COOK, A1C. WILLIAM K. MURPHY, A1C. GERALD ST. LAURENT, A1C. DEAN R. BRADY, CAPT. RONALD D. YOHO, CAPT. MARTIN LOPEZ, JR., 1ST LT. BOBBY J. McGUIRE, AIRMAN LOU ANN WESOLOWSKI, S. SGT. MARIE ASHMORE, SGT. ANNE Y. LOUDERMILK, SGT. GREG R. PUSATERI, A1C. STEPHEN R. HINES, 2D LT. MARIANNE OWENS, SENIOR AIRMAN DONALD W. ROBBINS, S. SGT. JAMES M. CONNELL, AND 1ST LT. BRENDA HOUSTON-WILLIAMS, ALL OF THE U.S. AIR FORCE

Airman COOK. My name is A1c. Michael Cook. I am with the 3245th Security Police Squadron. I have been in the Air Force for 1 year and 3 months, and I have been stationed at Hanscom Air Force Base since July of 1980.

Airman MURPHY. My name is A1c. William Murphy. I am assigned to the geophysics laboratory. I am an electronics technician, and I work with the engineering squad.

Airman ST. LAURENT. My name is A1c. Gerry St. Laurent. I work for the 3245th Civil Engineer Squadron. My occupation is a firefighter. I am married, 22 years old from Weymouth, Mass.

Airman BRADY. My name is A1c. Dean Brady. I am from Massachusetts. My occupation in the Air Force is cryptographic communications equipment specialist. I am with the 2014th Communications Squad at Hanscomb Air Force Base. I am married, have a newborn son, 3 months old.

Captain YOHO. My name is Capt. Ron Yoho. I am presently assigned to the geophysics laboratory at Hanscomb where I am the commanding executive officer and section squadron commander. I am engineer by trade. I have bachelor with a master's in engineering. In September, I will return to school for a Ph. D. in electrical engineering under Air Force sponsorship, so most of my perspective is from an engineering background.

I am married and have a couple of preschool children, and my prinicpal duties in the laboratory consist of responsibility for all the administrative, disciplinary, and personnel for 100 military people assigned to the laboratory.

Captain **Lopez**. I am Captain Lopez. I work at Hanscomb as the intelligence systems planner as electrical engineer. I have had 10 years in the military service, 8 years in the Army and 2 in the Air Force. I have a bachelor of electrical engineering and four children, and of course I'm married.

Lieutenant **McGuire**. Mr. Chairman, my name is Lt. Bobby J. McGuire, and I am the education and training officer at Hanscomb Air Force Base. I have been in 10 years, I have 7 years enlisted service and 3 years commissioned service. I have a bachelor's degree in business management. I completed my degree while in the service, and I used the Vietnam era GI bill.

I am 30 years old, I am a single parent and have a son, 3 years old.

Airman **Wesolowski**. Good morning, my name is Airman Wesolowski. I am stationed at Hanscomb and have been there for 10½ months. I work in a section of accounting and finance, in paying and collecting. I am single and I am 18.

Sergeant **Ashmore**. My name is S. Sgt. Marie Ashmore. I am a member of the 3245th Air Base Group. I am a personnel technician, and I am currently the noncommissioned officer in charge of customer service unit. I am married, my husband is also an enlisted member, and I am from Louisiana and I am 30 years old, been in the service 9 years.

Sergeant **Loudermilk**. My name is Sgt. Anne Loudermilk. I am assigned to the Air Force clinic at Hanscomb. I work in the veterinary clinic as a food inspector. My husband is also in the Air Force. He works for the dental clinic.

I am 23 years of age.

Sergeant **Pusateri**. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. My name is Sgt. Greg Pusateri. I am assigned to the 3245 Air Base Group Squadron at Hanscomb. I am a recreation specialist in charge of intramural and varsity sports. I currently hold an associate degree in recreation supervision.

I am 25 years old, I am married and have one child.

Airman **Hines**. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. My name is A1c. Stephen R. Hines. I am in 3245th Civil Engineer Squadron at Hanscomb. I am an electric powerline specialist, single, 23 years old. I am from Philadelphia, Pa., and I have been in the service, in the military, for 13 months and 3 days and approximately 4 hours.

Lieutenant **Owens**. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. I am 2d Lt. Marianne Owens. I am a budget analyst at the Electronics Systems Division at Hanscomb.

I am 22, I graduated from the Air Force Academy last spring and this is my first assignment.

Airman **Robbins**. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. My name is Senior Airman Donald Robbins. I have been in Hanscomb Field about 12 months. I am a project manager in charge of ground base surveillance. We have 10 radar sites throughout the Air Force.

I am 26 years old, I have a wife and a 14-month-old daughter.

Sergeant CONNELL. I am Sergeant Connell. I am assigned to the 3245th Air Base Group and right now I am in special actions. I have had 10 years in the military, two children, future divorce. She's also in the military.

Lieutenant HOUSTON-WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I am 1st Lieutenant Houston-Williams. I am assigned to Hanscomb Air Force Base, Electronics Systems Division. I am presently in a job assignment as electrical engineer. I work with the assistant program officer, and my job is to do the planning of the development, testing and evaluation phase of the item that we are procuring.

Hanscomb Air Force Base is my first assignment, and I have 2½ years in the service.

Mr. EDGAR. Let's go through a couple of very quick questions, yes or no, handraising kind of questions. And then we will get to some of the meat of your particular feelings.

Yes or no, is education a viable incentive for recruitment into the Air Force?

Yes?

[All hands raised.]

Mr. EDGAR. How many no's?

[No hands raised.]

Mr. EDGAR. If an adequate amount of money is provided, can education be a retention device within the Air Force?

Anyone have a no for that?

[No hands raised.]

Mr. EDGAR. Yes?

[All hands raised.]

Sergeant CONNELL. One comment. I am Sergeant Connell, I am assigned to the 3245 Air Base Group and I am right now in Special Actions. I've got 10 years, 3 months and 6 days and I will separate in 45 days.

Mr. EDGAR. For what reason?

Sergeant CONNELL. The GI bill.

Mr. EDGAR. If the leave of absence provision were provided and/or if we lifted the 1989 date, would you stay?

Sergeant CONNELL. The bill is coming in October 1, I separate June 8.

Mr. EDGAR. So that it will not help you to stay and be retained in the system.

How many of you are aware of other people who are doing as this gentleman is doing, and that is getting out to utilize their GI benefits before the 1989 deadline?

Airman BRADY. My supervisor. He has been in 8 years and he is getting out to take benefits.

Captain YOHO. Yes we have people getting out to take advantage of the GI bill.

Mr. EDGAR. I want you to say that really loud for the Veterans' Affairs Committee and for the people back in Washington, because there have been a number of people who said there isn't that pressure. People have testified there isn't that pressure, and yet many of the people within the uniform services have told us of that pressure of the GI bill.

How many of you think that it would be a mistake, and unequitable for us not to do something in terms of grandfathering people in between 1976, when the Vietnam era GI bill was terminated, and the October 1, 1981, target date that some of us are working on in this particular bill?

Captain YOHO. I believe we need something and it could be done, sir. We have had several programs where 1 month buys you 2 months, benefit or something, a transition period, or maybe 1 month gets you a half month, it takes 2 months to get 1 month, sort of a reverse transition period.

So that for people who are, after January 1, 1977, up until the effective say October 1 of this year, that there would be a kind of a compromise between giving them the whole thing, just because they are on the board, but not keeping them from having anything. It would be a compromise with some retention.

Mr. EDGAR. A transition period.

A number of people have gone to college and then come into the military. Under the basic education opportunity grants, which are now being cut back, there are a large number of people out there who have debts to pay back to the U.S. Government for providing them education.

Would it make any sense if we had a provision in this particular bill that would provide for, if you served for 3 years, a GI education bill, because they've already gotten their education, and at the end of the 3 years rather than being qualified to get a benefit you would, in fact, have had your education loan paid off and you would not be in arrears for that.

Does that make any sense to you?

Airman BRADY. When he is paying back the loan from going into the service, and then he comes into the service because he owes the Government money, then what is he going to get while he is in the service serving? Is he going to get so much money, and so much money pays off the debt?

Mr. EDGAR. Under this crazy plan that I am suggesting as just a discussion point, he would serve 3 years to pay off his last debt, and we might be able to give him some benefit for serving an additional 3 years, or an additional 6 years. But his service or her service would be a way in which they would have debt forgiveness for the basic education that they have been provided already.

It's sort of a get your GI bill ahead of time, and that would be paid off over time. I am not sure how the provisions would work exactly, but I don't think you could accrue both benefits. You would earn the paying off of your loan.

Airman BRADY. Right, but what does he get for those 3 years he is serving?

Mr. EDGAR. He get his debt forgiven. He gets the All-Volunteer Force salary, and he doesn't have to pay back the Federal Government.

Airman BRADY. So, Mr. Chairman, in those 3 years what does he live on?

Mr. EDGAR. He lives on his salary.

Airman BRADY. But he is getting regular base pay?

Mr. EDGAR. Yes, he is getting a base pay with everybody else. What he is doing is, he is accruing a GI educational benefit that he has already taken in the 4 years of college, or the educational loan. And once he reaches that third year point, the miliary sends a check to whatever agency loaned him that money and pays off the loan, so that his service, along with his salary, his service and accruing of benefits pays off that loan.

Sergeant **Loudermilk**. So what about the person who has gone through 4 years of college, moved into the Air Force, gets that 4 years of college paid off, and then serves an additional 4 years and wants to go on through specialized school, such as medical school? Will he get the benefits of this GI bill to pay for that?

Mr. **Edgar**. We really haven't written the provisons yet. What you might do, for example, if you serve for, let's say a month of benefits and you have 36 months of loans, you serve for 36 months your loan is forgiven. If you serve an addiitonal 3 years or an additional time period, then you begin to accrue your own benefits for additional education, just like everybody else would accrue.

I am just thinking of a provision, it would be more of a recruitment provision but there's a lot of people out there with outstanding debts. The debtor comes to the door and says "pay up," or finds people who have avoided paying up, who are declaring bankruptcy and doing all kinds of other crazy things to get out of paying the benefit. Could we turn around in a positive sense and say, if you join the All-Volunteer Force here is the way that you could have your debt forgiven?

That's just a thought. Let's go back now to some specific questions, and I think Mrs. Heckler may want to have some questions that deal with the whole question of education.

Mrs. **Heckler**. I think in the interest of time I would only ask one question, and that is the question of transferability. Now I understand, are all of you in critical skill areas?

How many in the panel are in critical skill areas?

Airman **Hines**. What do you define as a critical skill area? One hand kind of washes the other. Like, I am electric power lines specialist, but the people at ESD headquarters, can't do their job if they've got no power. So every job is really critical. I can't do my job if there's no place to go, if there's no trucks.

So every job just helps each other out.

Mrs. **Heckler**. My basic question is, Although most of you would qualify for critical skills designation and therefore be eligible for the transferability of benefits, do you feel that relaying the benefits just to that area designation is fair, or do you believe the transferability should actually apply to all who serve the requisite number of years?

Why don't we just have a show of hands? How many feel that the coverage should be universal for all in the service?

Mr. **Edgar**. Everybody.

[All hands raised.]

Mrs. **Heckler**. Thank you.

Mr. **Edgar**. It's hard to put the show of hands on the record——

Mrs. **Heckler**. It's a unanimous vote.

Airman **Brady**. Mrs. Heckler, you asked about cost of living across the States.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Mr. Edgar asked that, and I told him the quality of living was very high.

Mr. **Edgar**. I am in charge of the East Coast Coalition and we are always looking at the Federal Government and its impact on our region. And in the 18 States of our coalition the cost of living is higher than it is in Tennessee, Mississippi, and Alabama. The cost of living may be the same around the country, but the cost of buying a house, the cost of buying food, the cost of tuition is different.

The question I am raising is, should there be a basic benefit that everybody gets, and then tuition that is given to the school that person goes to, depending on the amount of tuition an extra kicker, some dollar amount to be determined. That is an idea that has been tossed around, and we are just trying to get some data.

Airman **Cook**. Well, I lived down in Texas and I couldn't believe how cheap it was to live down there. I was just married and had a fully furnished apartment for $200 a month. Come up here, got to buy furniture. I live off base; I'm not eligible to live on base. I've got to pay $300 rent with nothing, plus utilities to live in this area, off base. I work a second job.

I don't have time to take care of tuition from the service while I work a second job while I live off base, until I get rank enough to live on base. By that time I could only have maybe a year left in the service while I am on base, if I just stay my 4-year commitment.

And as I am covered right now, I am under no GI bill. So if I wanted to get covered by any GI bill here, I would have to extend or reenlist for 6 years to get full benefits from the day that it's acted in, because my 2 years is August and if I want 6 years come October, I've got to go and enlist for 6 years.

But there is a good thing because in my field there is a high reenlistment bonus. But is it worth that much hassle and 6 years of a commitment, where the outside world is paying so much money for my specific career field? And my career, my mission on Hanscomb is to provide secure communications to the base and local outlying communities.

I think that's a pretty critical area, but it isn't a critical area as the Air Force specs say it is.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Well, I can tell you that as a result of all the hearings, and I would include today, I would certainly feel that if we include the tranferability option, which seems to be one of the most attractive features of the bill, it would have to be extended to all who are in the service and who qualify for the requisite number of years. In order to be fair, if that were the case, I think that would have a very attractive inducement for reenlistment and to the long-term commitment to the military.

Mr. **Edgar**. We have very limited time, and I am willing to take about 2 or 3 additional minutes, and it would seem to me that there are really three kinds of areas we would want to cover in those minutes, which is not really very much time.

One is, I asked earler, the question what bugs you about the military, about the Air Force. I asked that of the Army, I should ask that same question of you.

Second, you may have a question you want to ask of us, that you want to at least get on the record, and, third, you may have a comment that you want to at least get on the record, that you want to make in light of all the things that have been said, all of the different provisions of the bill. And I don't want to miss that particular comment. The only thing I ask is that you be brief in terms of let's brainstorm this very quickly.

Is there a question? Is there something that bugs you you can be brief about? Is there a comment you want to make on the legislation, so that we take that back with us as we begin to draft the legislation? Just raise your hand if you want to say something, and we will get you quickly.

Give us your name as you say it.

Airman ROBBINS. Yes, sir, I am Senior Airman Don Robbins. One of the things that bugs me about the service is we are always screaming how badly we need quality people. From my experience, I have seen a lot of quality people come into the Air Force and leave the Air Force.

They came in with the goal of getting an education or doing a job, or getting a special skill. Whenever they find out that that skill is full because of certain dollar allocations, or certain criteria they might not meet because of commitment in service or job commitment, they cannot fulfill their goals and because of this we are losing an awful lot of people.

Mr. EDGAR. Good comment.

Sergeant ASHMORE. My name is Sergeant Ashmore, and I would like to say that I will probably be in that number that gets out, takes full advantage of the GI bill unless I am included under the new bill. I have been in 9 years and the GI bill runs out in 1989, and I am not due for retirement until 1991.

Mr. EDGAR. Thank you.

Airman MURPHY. My name is A1c. Murphy. What I was wondering was why do the legislators feel that they are giving the military back a GI bill? During the Vietnam era we had a GI bill, and they feel like they are giving it back. They took it away, so why do they feel that they are giving us something?

It's voluntary now, we are trying to get people to come in. Then there was draft. You already had the people, you had to worry about keeping them. And now you have to worry about getting them. It feels like they don't understand, true that the education is a good part of it. Basically coming in they can get a skill, and then probably get out.

I don't really understand that they are not really giving the military anything, they are just giving it back.

Mr. EDGAR. Let me just answer that quickly, and maybe Mrs. Heckler has a comment. Congress doesn't make rational—I mean, we don't sit around in a room and come up with rational thoughts in most instances. We vote on issues. And the recommendations came from the President of the United States, at that time it was Gerry Ford, to terminate the Vietnam era GI bill because most of the GI bills were based on war-related activities—World War II, Korea, Vietnam.

When the Vietnam era bill was put in place we grandfathered in the people who were in the cold war period of the late 1950's. It was a financial consideration, I think, in December of 1976 when it was terminated. I don't think anybody understood the impact that that would have on recruitment, but now that we go back and look at those figures some are saying—and some of us are relatively new Members of Congress—the education value of that bill was far greater than the cost to the Government of that particular provision and we will, in fact, get more money back for every dollar we commit to education.

We are also now at a different point in history where we are trying to fine-tune the All-Volunteer Force. There have been a lot of critical comments made about it. Last year we made an increase in salary; some will say it was not significant enough, but it was an attempt to make the military salaries more equitable.

This year we are coming out and saying, we ought to add to that an education benefit because we saw the value in the Vietnam era and we made a mistake in terminating that benefit. It looks to you like the ups and down of the legislative process, but I think it's basically different points in history with different people making those kinds of decisions.

Mrs. Heckler, do you want to comment on that at all? I don't want to be unfair.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Yes. I just want to say that the fact of the matter is the GI bill has traditionally been a vehicle with which to reward those who serve, especially during the war. Each GI bill had a time frame. World War II, which was the beginning of the GI bill. The greatest unfariness in all of veterans' history is that we have never really rewarded the veterans of World War I, and that remains really a deep blemish, I believe on American history.

The fact is that the GI bill was passed after World War II as a means of readjusting, helping the servicemen, readjust to civilian life. It has a specific time frame. The Vietnam-era bill was equally limited, based on the precedent of the World War II GI bill. The difficulty, however—and there were significant differences which related to the whole problem of Vietnam.

The Vietnam bill, first of all, was not as well publicized. Those who were eligible were not aware that the bill had passed in Washington because the outreach, it was not accepted. And for that reason I believe that the Vietnam-era bill should have been extended for a longer period of time.

Now the fact of the matter is, the second reason I believe the Vietnam-era bill was not adequate was because the level of benefits were not as great as they were after World War II. After World War II the benefits would pay for a full college education, and in the Vietnam era they changed the system to provide a specific payment to each single service person. This could not cover the new cost, the escalating cost, of education.

Nonetheless, it was a vote by the Congress to limit the GI bill to a specific period of years, and I personally have felt that the Vietnam-era bill should not have been limited because I do not believe that the time really effectively ran from the date the bill passed, because the veterans did not know that those benefits were available to them.

Now the fact is now here we are looking at the GI bill, and we are looking at a new GI bill and a new level. That is why we are listening to military personnel for the first time. Every prior GI bill related to veterans benefits and were available after one became a veteran. That is currently the system which prevails under the VEAP program. You have to become a veteran and then the Veterans' Administration will contribute $2 for every dollar that the person contributes.

What we are talking about now is a bill that would apply to those in the military as well as to the veterans. It's a retention tool for the military per se. Earlier, one of the debates in the Congress, which I don't think my colleague was there to hear, is a question when we formed the All-Volunteer Force whether or not the military, the Department of Defense, should pay for educational benefits as a tool of recruitment, or should the Veterans' Administration pay.

Because of this dispute, the feeling on the Veterans' Committee was that the Armed Services Committee should pay for it, the Department of Defense. This has been resolved now I think very largely by a new feeling about defense in general and a new concept of sharing the veterans' benefits with the ongoing military needs.

So that we are in a different era and we are talking about a bill that is very different than anything that has ever gone before. But this is something new that will be given. It is not like the VEAP program in which you will be asked to contribute. This is going to be a program, if it passes, in which the Government will make the contribution on a monthly basis for each month of service, active duty service, they will make a contribution in educational benefits and possibly a contribution in educational benefits that can be transferred to another family.

The historical precedent is that this is the first time in a peacetime period that we will ever have passed a GI bill.

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you for your contribution. I offer you the same option that I offered the previous panels and that is in the next few weeks we are going to be marking up the legislation. I would like to hear from you if you have specific comments, you just have to write Bob Edgar, Washington and the information will get to me, at the U.S. House of Representatives. I am sure Mrs. Heckler would be interested in the same kind of comment.

I want to thank all of you for taking the time to be here this morning.

Let's move to our panel of recruiting people. We have several military, Army recruiters and one Air Force recruiter and we would like to move to that mode at this time.

With all the medals you have, you don't have to impress us because you have already impressed us with all the honors and awards that all of you have won.

Let me thank you for being patient with us. You are the next to the last group to share in the formal set of hearings this morning. This afternoon we are going to visit out at Fort Devens and talk to some additional people.

You have heard a lot of testimony. Following you will be a panel of veterans service groups, and we would like to complete the morning session by 12:30, not only because we have to get to Fort Devens but also because our reporter can barely continue to talk.

So let's go through the recruiting panel and let me ask each of you to introduce yourselves and let's do what we did witn the one previous panel, and that is introduce yourself and in the introduction if you want to highlight a couple of the key points on the bill, that would be very helpful.

STATEMENT OF A PANEL OF MILITARY RECRUITERS CONSISTING OF MASTER SERGEANT POULIOT, U.S. AIR FORCE; SGT. LEGRANT SMITH, U.S. ARMY; SGT. VAL ATKINSON, U.S. ARMY; SERGEANT HYCHE, U.S. ARMY; CAPT. TOM HAWLEY, U.S. ARMY; SGT. GARY ADAMS, U.S. ARMY

Sergeant POULIOT. I am M. Sgt. George Pouliot and I am assigned to the 3501 Air Force Recruiting Group at Hanscomb Air Force Base, currently performing duty in the Boston area. I currently supervise 11 recruiters assigned to Boston, Cambridge, Quincy, Waltham, and Norwood recruiting offices.

I have been in the Air Force since June of 1963 performing duties as administrative specialist for 7½ years, seeing duty at Westover Air Force Base, Mass. France, Spain, 4 years at the Pentagon prior to volunteering for recruiting duty.

I have been in recruiting for over 9 years and have been in most every position in recruiting there is to have. I have recruited during the draft days, and I highly favor the All-Volunteer Force. I am a graduate of the Air Force NCO Academy in residence and the senior NCO Academy by correspondence. I have 3 years of college, hold an associates degree from the community college of the Air Force and will receive another associates degree from Middlesex Community College in May.

I am 35 and married with three dependent children. My wife is a former Air Force member of 5 years, and is currently taking advantage of the old GI bill.

I personally feel that the military of today is an alternative to employment welfare, and the people are not getting what they desire out of civilian life, therefore they look toward the military to get that. As the unemployment rate increases, as the cost of living increases, and as the loans and money become scarce, they look toward the military to satisfy those needs.

I feel that very few people enlist for patriotism only. All enlistees have visions of getting something by enlisting, such as training, which is associated with vocational training, education, getting their 4 years of college, and third, security, the security of having a job, having a paycheck.

Those, in my opinion, are three benefits that young men and women join the Air Force. Your bill is an outstanding proposal in both a recruitment enticement and also to try to keep the people within the military. I highly endorse your bill H.R. 1400.

Mr. EDGAR. Thank you very much.

Sergeant Smith, we will turn to you and then go to Sergeant Atkinson.

Sergeant SMITH. My name is Legrant Smith and I am a U.S. Army recruiter in the City of Brotherly Love, Philadelphia. I have been in a recruiting unit for 10 years. I am married, I have two kids. I have utilized the GI bill under the Vietnam era to successfully complete my masters degree. And I am impressed with that, I like H.R. 1400, especially the transferable benefits.

Like some of my other peers I believe it should be done at 6 years as opposed to 8, 10 or 12 years, because most people who decide to stay in after 6 years are really on a mode of saying that they are going to stay for 20 years. Some of the people who are coming in now are a little older.

I think that your bill does a little better than what we are dealing with right now in Philadelphia as far as a 2-year GI test program, and it does not preclude an individual from participating regardless of his aptitude area score. And I think that that's unique.

My job is to enlist at least 50 qualified individuals per month out of the city of Philadelphia. That seems to be a small task but it ends up being a large task once you try to get kids already out of school. We are trying to get a higher quality of military, Army, Navy, and Air Force, and I think in order to entice these people to go into the military for 2 years, 3 years, or 4 years we need to give them something substantial to replace what they are going to do while they are out of school for 2 years or 3 years.

In order to get these people, we talk about the SAT's, PSAT's, and the ECT's, and if they can qualify to go to college and get a scholarship, then it's going to be hard to get this higher category to go into the Army.

Mr. EDGAR. Thank you very much, Sergeant Smith.

Sergeant Atkinson?

Sergeant ATKINSON. My name is Sergeant Val Atkinson, and I have been in recruiting now approximately 13 years so that means I spent some recruiting time prior to the All-Volunteer Force.

My present job is a trainer of recruiters. I have spent 9 years, as we affectionately call it in recruiting, carrying the bag. That means having a quota each month. And for the past 4 years I have been a trainer of recruiters, and I am recruiting now in the Baltimore-Washington district recruiting office at this time.

I am 38 years old and I have been in the Army approximately 18½ years. I am going to retire at 20, by the way. A brief description of my jobs prior to coming to recruiting, I was with the Air Defense Command in Okinawa and also in Norfolk, Va.

I am married and I have two children. I live in Maryland with my wife and family at this time.

I too, like Sergeant Smith, have taken advantage of some of the opportunities to further my education. I entered the military service with approximately 1½ years of college, and since that time I have gone to complete an associates degree, a bachelor's degree, a master's degree and I am contemplating starting on a doctoral this fall.

So the educational programs that have been provided in the military since I have been in have been very good. And I have a lot of fine things to say about them. But as far as the H.R. 1400 is concerned, there are a couple of things I would like to bring out that have been missing previously that I would like to talk a little about.

And that is from a recruitment standpoint in terms of what we need to entice prospective enlistees to take a look at some of our programs, we haven't talked about some of the influences. What I mean by that are the people who have a direct bearing and influence on the decisionmaking on the part of these young people coming out of high school. We are talking about the principals, the faculty, the school administration, we are talking about parents, and people in those categories.

And when we come up with the GI bill, any type of educational bill, those are the people who will probably understand it best. Those are the people who will have a better job selling this, and in turn using it to sell the product. We are probably going to make quite a bit of money in terms of drafting a bill that not only is attractive to 17- and 18-year-old youngsters, but is attractive to the individual who is responsible for financing that youngster's education, that is, his father, because he is the one who is going to have to see that.

We in recruiting now have kind of jumped the gun and we have some programs that we are going to develop very soon that have to do with options, where each recruiter will have to sit down and go over step by step not only money in terms of the salary that the prospective enlistee will be making, but we are talking about educational benefits. We are talking about all types of financial and other type benefits that he will receive with 2-, 3-, or 4-year enlistment.

The applicant is to take this information back with him to share with his parents, with his educators. So we think we are going to be able to do quite a bit on that.

The other item I wanted to talk about was loan forgiveness. I don't know whether or not your bill is going to have something involved in that, but I think that is a critical item for us in the recruitment business. A couple of the other panels previous to this one talked about the immaturity of some of the young folks coming in today. And if we had our druthers, I am sure we would rather have the 21-year-old that had 1 or 2 years of college, and maybe even had some work experience prior to coming in the military, if we had the option. Those are the people who may be in some financial trouble, to a slight degree, may have committed themselves to a loan or grant or whatever. And with this program we can get the guy who is going to be a little bit more mature and who has a greater possibility of staying on active duty, and can attend to business.

As far as the transferability clause is concerned, I would say that we need some type of commitment on the part of the service member that as soon as he makes the commitment to become a career soldier, possibly at the 4-year mark if he reenlists for 6 years, or at the 6-year mark if he reenlists for 4 to take him to 10, that at that time he should become eligible to participate in the transferability for spouse, even though he may not have children.

And the last comment I wanted to make was about another comment. As I mentioned before, I am definitely getting out at 20 years, and one of the reasons for that is quality of life items—the GI bill, more money, and that type of thing are not enough of an incentive sometimes to keep good quality people in the military, especially when they feel they have opportunities to do as well, and in some cases better, in the private sector. So for that reason I am getting out at 20 years.

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you.

Sergeant Hyche?

Sergeant **Hyche**. I am presently a U.S. Army recruiter. I am stationed in the Columbia District Recruiting Command. I have been with the U.S. Army Recruiting Command for approximately 1½ years.

I am presently 31 years old and I have been in the military for 10 years, 5 of which I spent with the U.S. Marine Corps. My previous jobs and assignments in the military consist of infantry, airborne, reconnaissance, Special Forces operations NCO, and radio operator supervisor. I spent 3 years with the Special Forces group at Fort Devens, Mass. I am presently married and I have one child.

I think that H.R. 1400 is a basic foundation for what we need. I think that under the prerequisites in order to qualify for the bill, there should be something added in order to obtain the quality person that we need. I think there should be a score factor such as the military entance exam built into that. Right now we have a program at my DRC which is noncontributory. It has prerequisites, basically what you have here but in addition and Armed Forces qualifications test score of 50 or higher.

Personally, I feel that is a little high. I think it should be around 31, somewhere around there. I feel with this built in you are getting a quality person, so to speak. As far as the transfer to dependents, I think that alone would convince me to stay in the military.

I am right at the 10-year mark, and I plan on staying in the military, but I would like something I could give to my dependents because I look at it this way. By me spending 20 years in the military, I will have a career waiting for me once I retire. In order to benefit from the educational benefits that I have, the GI bill, I feel there should be a transferability clause included in that also.

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you very much.

Captain Howley?

Captain **Howley**. Good morning. My name is Capt. Tom Howley and I was born and raised in the city of Boston.

Mr. **Edgar**. You can tell.

Mrs. **Heckler**. Sounds good, Captain Howley.

Captain **Howley**. My present job right now is I am the Lowell Area Commander for Recruiting Affairs in northeastern Massachusetts. I have eight recruiting stations that cover the northeastern part of the State of Massachusetts.

I have been in my particular job for 10 months now. I am 30 years old. I have been in the Army for 7 years. I was commissioned as a second lieutenant in armor, I transferred into military intelligence. I was intelligence officer in a missile battalion and I have been the intelligence officer and security officer in nuclear battalions and I was quarter operations officer in 7th Corps with staff responsibility for the East German, Czechoslovakian border. Now I have taken over this job as area commander for Lowell.

I am married with one child.

I would like to bring up something that you brought up earlier, and that concerns the cost of living in the Boston area. We don't have any recruiters here that are from the Boston area, and I can personally attest to the fact that we have been severely impacted by the cost of living, especially for the recruiters. The biggest reason is many of our recruiters are geographically separated from any military facility. They don't have normal access to a post exchange or a commissary. And from a recruiting standpoint that can be tough, especially here in the Boston area.

I also wanted to address one of the peripheral topics that came up, and that is the December 1989 termination date for the Vietnam-era GI bill. As I said, I have been in the Army for 7 years and I have been trying strenuously for those 7 years to complete my masters. Due to the technical nature of my assignments and due to the unique nature of my current assignment, I just haven't been able to do it. I have been trying. So I am, indeed, concerned about the December 1989 terminate date.

I am personally very encouraged by the current philosophy in Washington and I think a good manifestation of that philosophy is appearing in the hearing today. I feel that the proposed legislation of the new GI bill, H.R. 1400, is very important in one significant aspect. If we do indeed call it the GI bill, that has had a very positive connotation among, as sergeant Atkinson pointed out, what we call the critical influences—the parents, the teachers, and so forth.

So I think it really will—there's not the overall, overriding incentive for the individual applicants or the potential recruits—it certainly will have a positive effect on these critical influences and that's the parents and the teachers again. So I am encouraged in that respect.

I feel that what you are proposing to do is tell the potential recruit that No. 1, we are deeply concerned about your material welfare, and that we want to pay you at a rate that is commensurate with those of your colleagues who chose not to go into the military.

No. 2, we are concerned about your material welfare in the sense that we intend to give you the finest state of the art technology and equipment that you will be expected to use. Again, I find that encouraging.

What we talked about specifically today, is we are indeed concerned about your educational progression. And we feel, we are talking collectively now, we feel that we want to give you every opportunity to progress in the educational sphere as well.

So the potential recruit does have those three things, in my mind, that he can look forward to. And I feel you are putting him in a good position in that respect.

From the Army recruiting standpoint there were two things I wanted to address. The first one is, right now the Army is the only service that has a 2-year option. I feel this has been of great significance to us in Army recruiting, a 2-year option that an individual can go in for 2 years and then spend the rest of the time in the Reserves. That has been of significance to us, like I said, and the point is not to lose that particular option. It really has helped.

The other item I wanted to bring up, again in reference to recruiting, is that I feel that it is absolutely and critically essential that the Army, as a service, has some degree of an edge or an advantage over the other services. And I say this for two reasons. No. 1, in order for us, and that is the Army at a national level, to collectively meet its end strength we have to put in almost 50 percent of all the recruits that are needed for military services. So we have close to half of the entire recruits that are required to come in, and that means that we are competing for 50 percent of the market, not a small portion of the market.

The second reason that I say we should have some sort of edge in it, or an advantage, is as a result of exhaustive studies that were completed just about the January, or slightly earlier than the January time frame, January of 1981. It was determined, and I think it was perhaps intuitively obvious beforehand, that the Army is perceived as being in any cases, certainly generally, more physically demanding and being associated with more disamenities than specifically the Air Force and the Navy. The Marines share that same perception that we have, but the Marines have a smaller amount of market to attract.

That being the case——

Mr. **Edgar**. The gentleman has 30 additional seconds, unfortunately, because of the pressure in time and the pressure on our reporter, we are going to have to move along.

Captain **Howley**. That was the end of what I wanted to say.

Mr. **Edgar**. Oh, I'm sorry. I hated to interrupt you at that point. I thought maybe you had a couple of additional things you wanted to share, but unfortunately we have a pressure of scheduling. Your contribution is really helpful.

Sergeant Adams?

Sergeant **Adams**. I am Sgt. Gary Adams and I am the station commander and army recruiter from Austin, Minn. I have been in the Army now for 10 years. I have been a recruiter for approximately 3 years.

I came in the Army in 1970, I have served in Vietnam, Panama, and Fort Hood, Tex. I became a recruiter in 1978. I was recruiter of the year in 1979 for the Minneapolis, Minn., recruiting command. In 1980 I was 200 percent of my assigned mission. And this year I am having probably my best year yet as far as a recruiter. I also have recruiters working for me.

I think the big contributory factor is the fact of our competitive edge. In Minnesota, like in different States you've got—the Army does anyway—the VEAP. But in Minnesota we have what we call Ultra-VEAP. This is where an individual puts in up to $100 a month for 2 years in the Army. The Government adds 2 for 1 for that. But the Army also throws on top of that a kicker of $8,000. So an individual can enlist in the U.S. Army for 2 years, have $15,000 after that time period to go on with their education.

On a 3-year enlistment or a 4-year enlistment in the Army in Minnesota you can have $20,100 to go on with your education. Your H.R. 1400 program is, as far as I am concerned, a pretty good program. I would like to see, like the Captain says, the army definitely retain the 2-year enlistment, we've got to have that.

But I would also, on the 2-year enlistment, instead of having to put 4 years into the Reserve, I am suggesting 1 year. If the person goes in the Army for 2 years then puts 1 year into the Reserves, they can go ahead on collecting the GI benefits.

The retention rate in the Army Reserve is a little bit higher than it would be in the Army. I think if that person puts 2 years in the Army, 1 year in the Active Reserve, they are going to retain that individual at that Reserve unit.

Other than that, I pretty much agree with your program. Like the Captain says, we have got to have a competitive edge in the Army because we do recruit approximately 50 percent of all the people going in the military. And the Army does not have quite a uniqueness that your Air Force and your Navy has. Since the Vietnam era it has picked up a little bit. A lot of people still think if you join the Army you are going to pick up a gun and go bang-bang and shoot at people. It's just not that way anymore.

That's about all I have. Thank you.

Mr. **Edgar**. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts for her questions and comments.

Mrs. **Heckler**. I would just like to say you have been an excellent panel. In fact, I am very impressed with all the witnesses today.

I feel that you have been the icing on the cake, because you actually do the recruiting and one of our great concerns is the recruitment of qualified people, and I certainly am impressed by the comments made by the Army in terms of the need for that competitive edge, and I can see that.

I want to say for the benefit of the Air Force that the master sergeant brought to my attention the fact that my earlier statement, while technically correct, that none of the services have actually met the recruitment goals that the Air Force has come the closest and almost made it, and only failed in maybe two tiny specialties.

So that I would give the Air Force four stars, and I will henceforth respond much more moderately, with the modification and deference to the Air force for what they have done. But, nonetheless, I see the recruitment problems of all the services, and certainly the Army has a very difficult one.

I would say that I am impressed with the stars and I am impressed with the educational level that you all have achieved, and the dedication that you have. And I feel we are very fortunate to have you.

Mr. **Edgar**. We heard from some people who are in charge of the recruiting system in Washington, so we have heard the message of recruiters before.

There were a couple things that were said in Washington that were not said here, and I think I can get agreement on these four statements, but let me just throw them out and if you disagree or want to say anything about them, I would appreciate it if you would keep it brief.

There were four comments made by the recruiters in Washington I thought were kind of helpful. The first was make it simple. They felt that any program we devise ought to be understandable, and Sergeant Atkinson, you made the point about parents and principals and community leaders who should understand it. The nice thing about the GI bill was it was relatively simple in terms of what the benefits were, and the more tiers you put on the program and the more complications you put on it, the more difficult it is to explain it.

And the second comment was make it adequate, make sure that the benefits provided are adequate to meet the needs of education.

The third comment was make it permanent because of the ups and downs of some of the programs, and this was particularly pointed out in light of the—of certain programs that had been put in place. You have the accelerated program in Minnesota, there are other test areas that have other kinds of test programs. We heard some testimony that those tests, while perhaps helpful in finding out what works and what doesn't work, were somewhat inequitable because not everybody qualified to meet those tests, and it was somewhat difficult in that they wanted a permanent GI bill in place, and not the tests and the changes and the ups and downs of the system.

So it was make it simple, make it adequate, make it permanent, and make it soon. Make sure you don't take forever to put it together.

Does that summarize, to a small degree, some of your feelings as well?

[No response.]

Mr. EDGAR. I would appreciate it, and we don't have time to take this testimony orally but I would appreciate your analysis from your perspective of the test programs that you have been asked to monitor and administer. There have been a number of tests out, I don't know if all of you qualify in key test areas but if you get a chance to just jot down some ideas about what is working in the test and what is not working, that would be very helpful to us in the next few weeks and I would appreciate it if you could provide that.

Does anyone else have anything they would like to say before I excuse you and go to the final panel at this point?

[No response.]

Mr. EDGAR. Let me thank you for taking the time. Some of you have come a long way and I want to say to Mr. Smith that it's good to have somebody from Philadelphia here.

I would like to call our last panel up and apologize for having them wait as long as they did. But we have asked the service organizations from this area to provide some testimony today. I will point out to everyone that all of the service organizations in Washington have testified before our full committee, and I think we have here John Swift, Vincent Stroud, John Scerra, Richard Wells—I will mention that the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Vietnam Era Veterans, a number of veterans' organizations from Washington have testified, and so all of your organizations are on record, all of them are on record in support of an education bill, and we appreciate your patience in taking the time to speak today.

Mr. EDGAR. Please introduce yourselves and give your statement and we will proceed. Again, we are in a little bit of a time bind.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD WELLS, DEPARTMENT COMMANDER, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. WELLS. My name is Richard Wells. I am the department commander of the Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. Chairman, Congresswoman Heckler, we have been asked to comment. We believe in House 1400, which proposes to amend title 38, U.S. Code, by adding a new chapter, 30, to establish the new program for vocational assistance for veterans and members of the Armed Forces.

We understand that our national organization has already testified and made their views known before the Subcommittee on Education, Training and Employment, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, March 24. And rather than review the whole statement, we would just like to support their position of our national organization.

I am cutting this short, because we are short of time. In closing, I wish to reiterate that the Disabled American Veterans does not object to innovative approaches to improving and strengthening the All-Volunteer Force through educational assistance programs, nor would we object to the VA administering such programs, so long as the Department of Defense maintains the responsibility for bearing the cost of entitlement for all the programs proposed by H.R. 1400.

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you. We will make your total statement a part of the record.[1]

Mr. Scerra, please introduce yourself.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH SCERRA, STATE ADJUTANT, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. **Scerra**. Mr. Chairman, my name is Joseph Scerra. I am the State adjutant of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of Massachusetts. I am sure you are well aware of the VFW's position insofar as recruitment is concerned.

If it were adopted, I think it would solve the recruitment problem, although it would be highly unpopular. But it would still furnish the entire country with a cross-section of the youth of our Nation in the Armed Forces.

I am going to try to be brief and simply state the objectives of our organization regarding H.R. 1400. And basically we believe this commitment to the Armed Forces requires an educational incentive program be implemented, and such a plan should embody a number of concepts.

One, that the benefits described by the plan should be fully funded by the Department of Defense, and the VA supplying only the personnel including their cost, to administer the program.

Two, that the thrust of such legislation be aimed primarily toward the use of the benefits by the veterans themselves. That the Reserves and National Guard be afforded the opportunity to become eligible, to some degree, for benefits under such a program.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my testimony which, I think you will agree, agrees with the policy of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, testimony that was given to you earlier in Washington.

Mr. **Edgar**. That is correct. Thank you for testifying.

Mr. Reagan, do you have comment you would like to make for the record?

---

[1] See p. 109.

STATEMENT OF JOHN REGAN, NATIONAL SERVICE OFFICER, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. **Regan**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is John Regan, I am the National Service Officer with the Disabled American Veterans, and our comments will be contained in the statement to be presented to you by Commander Wells.[1]

I would like to underline what you said earlier, though, Mr. Edgar, that if a bill of this nature is passed that it be adequate. In my daily dealings with veterans, even those who have been able to utilize the Vietnam bill, $311 a month is certainly not very much money for an individual who would like to go to an institution of higher learning.

The second comment I would have, we all have heard testimony this morning by various people, and Congresswoman Heckler mentioned that some of them have attained great educational goals. These people are to be commended, not only commended but anything Congress can do to keep these people on active duty should be done. We have heard people say they have masters degrees, and we have heard of people who are leaving because they have to take advantage of the GI bill, and I think that's a shame. Anything Congress can do to alleviate that situation would be, I am sure, for the good of the country.

That concludes my comments, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you.

The gentleman on the end?

Mr. **Harold**. My name is Joseph Harold, department manager of Disabled American Veterans, and I did not plan to make any statement here. We had a statement from the commander, and he is supporting the national program, and we are also.

Mr. **Edgar**. Thank you. I would like to yield to my colleague, Mrs. Heckler.

Mrs. **Heckler**. I would like to say that I would ask unanimous consent that the statement of the American Legion, which was to have been presented by John Swift, because of lack of time here could not be presented orally by him, I hope that the record can be left open and it can be inserted.

Mr. **Edgar**. Without objection it will be part of the committee record.[2]

Mrs. **Heckler**. I would like to say also that I think it is very important to have our veterans organizations testify on these issues. We have Mr. Scerra, who is national commander of the VFW, and presently the indispensable person in the VFW in Massachusetts.

And, again, the other three gentlemen, Joe Harold, the adjutant, and Commander Wells have made a contribution to the VA today. I feel very strongly that the veterans' organizations deserve a voice in this legislation. Because as you well know, we are facing a very serious problem in the funding of veterans' programs. And our priorities are also to care for the medical needs of our veterans. And the support of these organizations for the program and the question of the funding of the program I think has to be squarely on the record, and decision made between the Department of Defense and the Department of the Veterans' Administration.

---

[1] See p. 109.

[2] Retained in committee files.

I am pleased with the testimony of my colleagues on a Statewide basis. While I have great respect for the national organizations, I have even greater respect for our State leadership in all of our veterans' organizations. And I feel that they have made a contribution to the hearing today by suggesting the proposals and positions that they have taken. I appreciate their coming, and do not intend to ask any further questions.

Mr. Edgar. Thank you.

I have some homework for all of you. And that is in two areas. First, in the area of Vietnam veterans, the cutting in my opinion of the 91 readjustment counseling centers is a mistake. We need as much help as possible in the next 2 weeks in Washington to make sure that the readjustment counseling centers are returned.

I think you have access to and influence over members of Congress from the State of Massachusetts, and I think they ought to hear of your concerns, particularly for the Vietnam veteran who has taken the brunt of some of the proposed cuts.

But second, in the area of education, all of the service organizations support an education incentive. But in order to pass that, we need one more than half of 435 House Members who agree with whatever piece of legislation we put through.

I hope you will keep in touch with your national organization, and as we pass the bill out of our subcommittee, as we pass it out of the full Veterans' Affairs Committee, as we take it to the Armed Services Committee and to the Senate and get their consideration, as we attempt to get Senator Simpson to hold hearings on this important issue, as we attempt to place it on the President's desk, all the way long the line we are going to need some help, particularly Veterans of Foreign Wars and their political action activity had a great deal to do with the new President taking office. And it is my hope that you might also have a great influence in discussing with the new administration the importance of this particular bill.

We have heard from many people who are uniformed officers, almost to a person, support the education bill. We then turn to the civilian side of the Defense Department and many of them say, let's wait until we get the tests back, let's wait until next year or the following year from this piece of legislation. There may be some merit in that, and I am going to look at those aspects of waiting.

A great deal of testimony has occurred to indicate that the permanency of this program, the adequacy of this program, the nature of it, is needed now as a recruitment and retention device, is important. We may need your help in convincing the new administration to accept this bill a little earlier than they had planned, so that benefits can begin to be provided.

I know you will do that. You have been articulate in Washington and locally here, both in the area of Vietnam-era veterans and also in the area of getting an education bill, a G.I. bill, passed, we are going to need your help.

Mrs. Heckler. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make you aware of the fact that these individuals and their organizations are extremely effective in sending messages. In that most of the veterans' legislation, in fact, the bill that President Carter vetoed last year, the pay bill which also included the geriatric bill, would never have passed Congress or the veto would not have been overridden had there not been extremely strong and effective, persuasive grassroots lobbying of Members of Congress by veterans organization. I contest it all begin in Massachusetts. So that this group can do very well and is supportive of Vietnam-era veterans. Now maybe I'm a little provicial, if that's the case I apologize. We are duly proud of the veterans' organizations of the State and their concern for the country, which is what we are all talking about.

So, I bring up the past history because I think you are entirely right, that their involvement is really important at this time. This is an important bill that relates to the manpower needs which affect the United States. And I think the veterans' organizations that care so much about this country and its flag will also stand behind the development of incentives to keep the manpower at an all time high, with the best and the brightest attracted to the military.

And that is what this bill is all about. I know that the organizations are effective in transmitting messages, and I would expect that this will be one on their favorite list.

Mr. EDGAR. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Let the record show that there are a number of people that need to be thanked, the Army and Air Force liason people for coordinating the military people who are here, the veterans' committee staff people who have spent a lot of time in the six hearings that we have had.

I want to thank all of you personally for taking the time this morning to come to make the sacrifice to help us shape and construct a good G.I. bill.

This hearing stands adjourned. We will proceed to Fort Devens and to the afternoon hearing.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RICHARD H. WELLS, STATE COMMANDER, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Dear Congresswoman, we have been asked to comment, we believe, on House 1400, which proposed to amend title 38, U.S. Code by adding a new chapter 30 to establish a new program of educational assistance for veterans and members of the Armed Forces.

We understand that our national organization has already made their views known before the subcommittee on education, training and employment of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs March 24th; and rather than review the whole statement, we would just like to support the position of our national organization on this bill.

We all recognize the pending legislation as a proposal which is designed and intended as a recruitment and retention incentive for the all volunteer military force.

It is no secret that all volunteer force is in serious trouble, that it has fallen short of its recruiting goals and has had great difficulty in attracting and retaining high quality enlistees.

We have noted that the pending legislation has taken appropriate steps in an effort to insure higher quality personnel. Specifically, the bill requires that each serviceman must be a secondary school graduate or have a high school equivalency certificate in order to qualify for educational assistance under the proposed programs.

Since the legislation before this subcommittee today would provide the Department of Defense with a needed recruitment and retention device, the DAV has no quarrels with such congressional efforts to improve our military forces. However, we do object, as proposed in H.R. 1400, to the Veterans Administration "picking up the tab" for even a portion of a Department of Defense Recruitment and Retention program.

As you know, Madam Chairman, the Veterans Administration has been in the business of administering educational programs to this nation's veterans for more than 30 years. Without a doubt the VA has the experience and expertise in administering such programs. Therefore, the DAV would not object to the VA administering such a program, so long as the Department of Defense is responsible for all the necessary funding for entitlements.

Quite frankly, the DAV has reservations regarding the potential effectiveness of the programs proposed by H.R. 1400. That is, we question whether or not these programs will produce the desired results in terms of attracting and retaining higher quality personnel in the active forces and the selected reserve.

Our reason for raising this concern primarily rests with the fact that today, college age students are entitled to federally insured, subsidized loans, regardless of family income. Federally insured loans for college educations without any accompanying obligation for military service would appear to be far more attractive to these young people than the programs proposed by H.R. 1400.

However, we do understand that the Administration has proposed to change the Federal loan formula, as well as, tighten the requirements for basic educational opportunity grants. If the Administration's proposal becomes reality, then the programs proposed by H.R. 1400 may become more attractive to a greater cross section of American youth.

Also, we do wonder if it would not be more advantageous to await the results of the pilot program of educational assistance authorized by the Department of Defense Authorization Act of 1981 (P.L. 96-342).

Since this program has only been in existence a mere six months, the subcommittee might wish to consider that enactment of another Military Recruitment and Retention Educational Assistance program may be somewhat premature and counterproductive. This may be particularly true in light of the Administration's proposed cuts in the other Federal education programs.

In closing, Madam Chairman, I wish to reiterate that the disabled American veterans does not object to innovative approaches to improving and strengthening the all volunteer force through educational assistance programs. Nor would we object to the VA administering such programs, so long as the Department of Defense maintained the responsibility for bearing the cost of entitlements for all the programs proposed by H.R. 1400.

I again wish to thank you and the Members of the Subcommittee for providing the DAV opportunity of appearing here today.

DISPOSITION FORM

For use of this form, see AR 340-15; the proponent agency is TAGO

REFERENCE OR OFFICE SYMBOL AFZD-SFSA	SUBJECT Friday Report - 24 April 1981

TO TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN	FROM Commander 10th SFG (Abn), 1st SF Fort Devens, MA 01433	DATE 24 April 1981 SFC Shifflette/cfs/3102	CMT 1

1. NEWLY ASSIGNED PERSONNEL - During the period 17 April 1981 through 24 April 1981:

NAME	RANK	MOS	UNIT	ARRIVAL DATE	REASON
PERRY, James L. JR.	SGT	12B2S	HHC	810420	Newly Assigned
CZALSKI, Jason A	SP4	91B1S	HHC	810420	Newly Assigned
OAKLEY, John K.	PFC	12B1S	HHC	810420	Newly Assigned
BOOTH, Thomas M.	PFC	05B1S	HHC	810420	Newly Assigned
PARR, Brett, C.	PV2	11B1S	HHC	810420	Newly Assigned
PETERSON, Bryan	1LT	1105G	B/2	810417	Newly Assigned
AUSTIN, Maynard	CPT	11A5G	HHD/3	810416	Newly Assigned

2. DEPARTURES - During the period 17 April 1981 through 24 April 1981:

NAME	RANK	MOS	UNIT	LOSS DATE	REASON
MALDONADO, Santiago	SSG	94E30	Svc Co	16 Apr 81	PCS Korea
BURLEY, Douglas	SFC	94B30	Svc Co	17 Apr 81	PCS Germany
POSAVATZ, Tracy	SP4	67N1P	Svc Co	22 Apr 81	18th Army Band
MOORE, Johnnie	SFC	91B4S	B/2	18 Apr 81	ETS
HALFORD, Michael	SP5	75B2P	H/1	22 Apr 81	PCS/Germany

3. PROJECTED LOSSES - During the period 17 April 1981 through 09 June 1981:

NAME	RANK	MOS	UNIT	LOSS DATE	REASON	AWARD
SACCO, CARL	SP5	43E2P	SVC	25 April 1981	PCS	C
ALSTON, FRED	SP4	75D1P	SVC	10 May 1981	ETS	C
JOHNSON, ALTHEA	SP5	75B20	SVC	23 May 1981	ETS	C
DEAN, WILLIAM	SFC	76Y3P	SVC	31 May 1981	RETIRE	B
SICARD, DANIEL	SP4	71L1P	SVC	31 May 1981	ETS	C
BROUILLET, EDWARD	SGT	72E2P	SIG	21 March 1981	ETS	C
DREW, WALLACE	SSG	63B3P	SIG	27 April 1981	ETS	B
BILLINGSLEA, WILLIAM	SP4	72E1P	SIG	16 May 1981	ETS	C
MCHUGH, JOSEPH	SGT	05B2P	SIG	20 May 1981	ETS	C
WILLIAMS, DONALD	SP4	96B1P	10th MI	22 April 1981	PCS	C
HALL, JACK H.	SGT	05H4S	10th MI	24 April 1981	ETS	B
WOODS, ROBERT	SP5	71L2P	10th MI	29 April 1981	PCS	B
FACHET, GERALD S.	SGT	05H2S	10th MI	28 April 1981	PCS	C

DA FORM 2496 PREVIOUS EDITIONS WILL BE USED

24 April 1981

AFZD-SFSA (24 April 1981)
SUBJECT: Friday Report (24 April 1981)

NAME	RANK	MOS	UNIT	LOSS DATE	REASON	AWARD
MOORE, JOHNNIE	SFC	91B4S	B/2	18 April 1981	ETS	B
JAMES, RICK	SP5	91B2S	A/2	19 April 1981	ETS	A
HALFORD, MICHAEL	SP5	75B2P	H/2	21 April 1981	PCS	B
DODGE, DANIEL	SP5	91B2S	B/2	23 April 1981	ETS	B
BELL, TIMOTHY	SGT	11C2S	C/2	26 April 1981	ETS	B
VICK, GEORGE	SFC	11B4S	A/2	27 April 1981	PCS	B
DICKEY, STEPHEN	SSG	11B3S	H/2	28 April 1981	ETS	B
DADETTO, WAYNE	SGT	12B2S	B/2	29 April 1981	PCS	B
ALBERTI, MARK	SP5	91B2S	C/2	30 April 1981	ETS	B
KNAPP, KEVIN	SP5	91B2S	C/2	01 May 1981	ETS	B
GARNER, JOHN	SFC	12B4S	B/2	02 May 1981	PCS	B
FRANSEN, EVERETT	SFC	12B4S	B/2	02 May 1981	PCS	B
CAPASSO, WILLIAM	SGT	05B2S	C/2	14 May 1981	ETS	C
HENNIX, WALTER	SFC	11B4S	C/2	23 May 1981	PCS	C
YORK, CHRISTIAN H.	SGT	11C2S	A/3	20 March 1981	ETS	C
KNAPP, MICHAEL A.	SGT	12B2S	B/3	28 April 1981	ETS	B
SCAMAN, DENNIS E.	CPT	1105G	C/3	02 June 1981	ETS	B

4. INCOMING PERSONNEL - During the period 24 April 1981 through 17 May 1981:

NAME	RANK	MOS	ARRIVAL DATE
FERRARO, PHILLIP J.	SGT	Unknown	April 1981
MCGEE, ANDREW	CPL	76P10	April 1981
PUZZUOLI, DAVID	PFC	32H10	April 1981

FOR THE COMMANDER:

ROBERT A. SHORT
1LT, Infantry
Asst Adjutant